THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine;

&c. &c. &c.

For MAY, 1803.

Nunc vero non id agitur, boniſne an malis moribus vivamus, neque quantum, aut quam magnificum Imperium Populi Romani ſit, Sed Hæcce, cujuſcunque modi videntur noſtra, an nobiſcum unà Hoſtium futura ſint.

TACITUS.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

The True Churchmen aſcertained; or, an Apology for thoſe of the Regular Clergy of the Eſtabliſhment, who are ſometimes called Evangelical Miniſters: occaſioned by ſeveral modern publications. By John Overton, A. B. Mawman and Rivingtons, London; Wilſon, Spence, Todd and Wolſtenholme, York, &c. 8vo. PP. 422.

WE conſider the publication now before us as highly important, and as laying claim to the peculiar regard of every conſcientious miniſter of the eſtabliſhed church. But let us not be miſunderſtood. Its importance, in our eſtimation, ariſes much more from the nature and magnitude of the object which the author has in view, than from any ſucceſs which has attended his endeavours to attain it. If, however, he has failed, as we conceive he has, in eſtabliſhing the point which he labours to prove, we impute the failure to the badneſs of the cauſe, and not at all to the weakneſs of the pleader. Mr. Overton is, in fact, both an able and an artful advocate; and we certainly think that the intereſts of his clients could have been entruſted to few more zealous, or, to ſay the truth, more competent to do them juſtice. But there are ſome cauſes ſo hopeleſs and deſperate, as to baffle all the powers of learning and ingenuity; and ſuch, we are convinced, is that which our apologiſt has undertaken to ſupport. It has indeed been pronounced, as we are informed, by *very high authority*, that his book will not be eaſily anſwered; and we have reaſon to believe that it is regarded by *the party*, as altogether unanſwerable. But every one knows how apt minds, even the moſt ingenuous, are to be impoſed upon, without perceiving the impoſi-

tion, by arguments in favour of preconceived opinions. We are not, therefore, greatly intimidated by the self-complacency of Mr. Overton, or the confidence of his friends; but shall proceed to examine his principles and reasonings with that serious attention which the subject demands, and with all the impartiality of which we are capable. And, although we will not adopt his triumphant language (p. 43), "Let the reader, then, only exercise a little patience, and he *shall be fully satisfied* on the question;" yet we will presume to request the patience of our readers also: and we *trust* that they will see grounds to be satisfied that our author's decisions are, at least, not so certain and incontrovertible as he seems to suppose.

The professed aim of Mr. O.'s book is to prove that those of the English clergy "who are sometimes called evangelical ministers, are the only true churchmen." Of these, he says (Pref. p. xi.) "It is *intended to appear* that the characters in question are *true churchmen* of a *true church*, and therefore worthy of the title in the highest sense." The evangelical teachers, of the description here specified, certainly *do* pretend "to adhere strictly to the doctrines of the Church." (P. 17.) And he thus formally states the question to be determined between these teachers and the rest of the clergy: "WHOSE DOCTRINES ARE REALLY THOSE OF OUR ARTICLES, HOMILIES AND LITURGY? WHO, IN REALITY, TEACH THE DOCTRINES CONTAINED IN THESE FORMULARIES, AS THEY WERE FIRST DELIVERED BY OUR REFORMERS?" (Ibid.) And, in his Recapitulation, he thus unequivocally expresses himself: "Nay, let it be said whether the conclusion is not established on grounds equal to demonstration, that WE DO, and that THEY DO NOT *teach according to the plain, primitive, genuine doctrines of our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies:*" to which he immediately subjoins "*We* then are the TRUE CHURCHMEN; and, whatever astonishment certain critics may express at the affirmation, in a very fundamental and important sense of the word, Mr. Daubeny and his associates," whose notions he all along strenuously combats, "are DISSENTERS from the Church of England." (P. 397.)

The evangelical teachers to whom Mr. O. would exclusively appropriate the honourable appellation of *true Churchmen*, are frequently known by the less dignified name of *Calvinistic methodists*. He does not, however, undertake the vindication of all who have obtained that designation: for his apology, as his title-page bears, respects only such of them as are *regular clergy of the establishment*. He is, therefore, the ostensible advocate only of Calvinistic methodists *within*, and not of those *without*, the church; of such ministers as "equally respect, in their theory and their practice, the *doctrines* and the *constitution* of the established church; lament, most cordially, every occasion, and every degree of deviation from her; and wish for nothing so much as her *preservation in her genuine purity*. For *these*, and *these* EXCLUSIVELY, under whatever title they are found, it is the

the object of this work to apologize." (Pref. p. iv.) Again; "Let it be invariably inculcated," he says, "that, to constitute a genuine churchman, an obedience to her," the Church's, "authority is equally essential with an adherence to her doctrines." (P. 399.) He assures us that they are "the farthest possible from the fact, who represent the views and conduct of Dr. Haweis as a fair specimen of the general opinions of the clergy of the Church of England who are called evangelical:" and that "the general body of these divines as sincerely lament the *schism* of Dr. Haweis, as the *heterodoxy* of some other doctors." (Ibid.)

We shall certainly not be suspected, by our readers, of contemning church authority and discipline. Our opinions on that subject are sufficiently known; and we earnestly wish that sentiments similar to our own, respecting ecclesiastical unity and the sin of schism, were universally entertained by Christians. The regard which the persons here defended discover for regularity and order, is highly commendable, and shall not, by us, be defrauded of its due portion of praise. But our ingenious apologist was well aware that ministers may be found within the pale of the church, who are yet *false* churchmen. A clergyman, to be a *true* son of the church, must teach her doctrines, as well as conform to her discipline. In order, therefore, to substantiate the claim which he advances in favour of himself and of his friends, it was absolutely incumbent upon him to shew that they alone have adopted, and propagate, her real tenets. To shew this, indeed, is the principal aim which he has in view: and, according to him, these tenets are strictly and accurately in unison with those of Calvin. The proof of this position in general, he strenuously urges in his second chapter, intituled "The Real Sense of the Articles and Doctrines of our Reformers investigated," &c. in which he argues from "our different forms as they explain and illustrate each other; the title and preamble annexed [prefixed] to the articles; the circumstances and object of our reformers; their other public and approved writings; the authorities they respected; and their known private sentiments." (Pp. 44 and 69.) From all these sources of information he thinks himself warranted to conclude that the genuine doctrine of our church is Calvinism. "These sentiments," he says, meaning the private sentiments of the reformers, "we mean to shew were those which are now usually termed Calvinistic." (P. 69.) "The doctrines now often termed moderate Calvinism, she," the church, "unequivocally inculcates." (P. 95.) And, towards the end of the chapter, he thus sums up the result of his inquiries: "Here then we might well rest our whole question. The Church of England, we have seen strong reason for concluding, is *moderately Calvinistic*. The chief subjects of our apology are *professedly* so.—This circumstance, therefore, might at once decide who have *adhered* to, and who have *departed* from, the original and genuine doctrines of the Articles, as none but those accused of *methodism* even profess

to hold any tenet that is *Calviniſtic.*"* (P. 97.) But the prudence and caution of this apologiſt are equal, at leaſt, to his learning and ingenuity. He was ſenſible that the tenets of Calvin, when exhibited in their true and legitimate colours, diſplay ſuch a diſguſting maſs of impiety, blaſphemy, contradiction, and cruelty, as cannot fail to inſpire with horror or contempt, every mind which retains any ſentiments of reſpect for the Supreme Being, any ſpark of benevolence for its fellow-creatures, or even any glimmerings of reaſon and common ſenſe. He is anxious, of courſe, to exonerate the Church, and, by conſquence, his favourite evangelical divines, from the accuſation of maintaining theſe tenets in their full extent. He, in various places, pleads, as we have ſeen, for *moderate Calviniſm* only. But, as to get rid of the charge of holding the moſt ſhocking parts of the Calviniſtic ſyſtem was a point of great importance to his cauſe, he is not ſatisfied with incidentally diſclaiming them. On the contrary, he is at great pains to diſown them explicitly, and at large. After long contending for the Calviniſm of the ſtandards of the Church, he, at p. 93, thus proceeds:

" Nothing, however, is further from our purpoſe, than to infer, from what has been advanced in this ſection, that the preciſe theological ſyſtem of *John Calvin* in *all its parts*, and to *its full extent*, was intended to be eſtabliſhed in the 39 Articles, to the excluſion of every milder ſentiment. We think they have equally failed who have attempted to ſhow this, whether the exaltation or degradation of the national confeſſion has been their object. To ſay the leaſt, our eſtabliſhed forms do not *teach directly*† ſeveral doctrines which are contained in Calvin's Inſtitutions. They do not, with this work, affirm that the *fall of Adam* was the effect of a *divine decree:* they do not uſe the language it does, reſpecting the *extent of Chriſt's redemption:* they are ſilent concerning *abſolute reprobation*, which is here taught expreſsly. The authors of theſe forms unqueſtionably built upon *the ſame foundation* with this celebrated reformer, but they have not carried *the ſuperſtructure* to *the ſame height*. They were aware of the *extremes* to which ſome had proceeded on theſe ſubjects, and of the liability of the doctrines of grace to abuſe, and wiſhed therefore to expreſs themſelves with moderation and caution. They were aware of the inability of the human underſtanding to comprehend the *whole* of the divine procedure towards his creatures; and, of courſe, of the difficulties attending the ſubject, when purſued beyond a certain limit. They wiſhed, therefore, in framing a ſtanding public confeſſion, to decide no further upon theſe deep points than they believed the deciſion of importance, and for which they had the moſt expreſs and certain warrant of ſcripture. They wiſhed unequivocally to teach that man's *ſalvation* is *wholly of grace*, but that his *perdition* is

---

* The author muſt here mean any tenet that is *peculiarly* Calviniſtic—any tenet that diſtinguiſhes the School of Calvin from other ſchools in theology.

† Is not this a very ſignificant inſinuation that the three doctrines of Calvin, afterward mentioned, are taught by our Church, at leaſt *indirectly?*

of

of *himſelf*; and neither to make *God the author of ſin*, nor *man a mere machine*, and unfit to be treated as a *moral agent*. All beyond this they have left to be reſolved on the principle of human ignorance."

"It is ſaid," adds our author (p. 95), "that, in reality, there is no difference between this ſyſtem and the higher ſpecies of Calviniſm. It may be anſwered, however that be, the Church is only reſponſible for the doctrines ſhe *teaches expreſsly*, and not for the *inferences and conſequences* which may be deduced from theſe doctrines by thoſe who perhaps do not underſtand them, and which ſhe probably may diſavow."

"When, therefore," continues our wary apologiſt, (p. 96), "certain writers have formed a frightful ſyſtem of nothing but abſolute decrees, abſolute reprobation, and other extravagancies, which we diſavow, they may attack it as vehemently as they pleaſe; but it deſerves their conſideration that it is a creature of their own, and that in reſpect to *us*, at leaſt, the moſt pointed of their weapons falls "Telum imbelle ſine ictu."

We have inſerted this long quotation, that our readers may ſee with what anxious concern Mr. O. repels from his party, and, by conſequence, from the church, the credit of which muſt, in his opinion, ſtand or fall with himſelf and his friends, the imputation of adopting what he calls *the higher ſpecies of Calviniſm*. "In which of their writings," the writings of the divines whom he is vindicating, "can our opponents," ſays he, "find a ſingle paragraph that *goes beyond* the Sublapſarian ſcheme? But much may be found that comes *below* it. Mr. Daubeny," he adds, "may deduce his conſequences, aſſume the prerogative of knowing men's hearts, and inſiſt upon it, in ſpite of themſelves, that they hold doctrines which they *ſay, and believe, they do not*;* but it deſerves his conſideration, that ſuch a procedure is abſurd in itſelf, that it is contrary to the eſtabliſhed laws of controverſy, and that it is juſt as fair, and juſt as ſignificant, as it would be to infer, from his ſtronger expreſſions reſpecting *human agency*, that at the bottom he muſt be a ſocinian." (P. 96.)

We are unwilling to ſuppoſe that all this oſtentatious parade about the moderation of his Calviniſm is intended, by Mr. O., only to throw duſt in the eyes of his readers, though we are ſorry to obſerve that the whole of it has too much this appearance. We ſhould not, however, do juſtice to *our* readers, or to the cauſe which we have in hand, if we did not explicitly inform them that the whole of his defence, on this part of the ſubject, is labour completely loſt. No man, we affirm, and we affirm it confidently, can be a Calviniſt by halves. No man who embraces any one of the tenets peculiar to this ſyſtem can poſſibly reject the reſt. Mr. O., indeed, makes uſe of language directly calculated to miſlead and deceive. He talks of *abſolute decrees*, *abſolute reprobation*, and *other extravagancies*, as *creatures*

* We ſuppoſe that this muſt be an error of the printer; though we know not what the author intended preciſely to ſay. We conſulted Daubeny, as referred to in the margin; but no expreſſion ſimilar to this is there to be found.

of his opponents, which he and his party disavow. Now he tells us that they are *Sublapsarian* Calvinists; and do such, in truth, hold no kind of *absolute decrees?* Yes; they contend that the decree of *Election*, at least, is absolute: and his master will tell Mr. O. that, if this be admitted, the decree of *reprobation* is absolute also. "Multi quidem," says Calvin, "ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, electionem ita fatentur ut negent quenquam reprobari; sed insulse nimis et pueriliter: quando ipsa electio nisi reprobationi opposita non staret. Dicitur Deus segregare quos adoptet in salutem: fortuitò alios adipisci, vel suâ industriâ acquirere, quod *sola electio* paucis confert, plusquam insulse dicetur. *Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobat*; neque aliâ de causâ, nisi quòd ab hæreditate quam filiis suis prædestinat, illos vult excludere." Inst. Lib. 3. Cap. 23. Sec. 1.

This reasoning of Calvin we deem irrefragable. SOLA ELECTIO is *unconditional, absolute* election: it can mean nothing else; and for this our evangelical divines are strenuous advocates. When they teach us that God only *passes by* a great part of mankind, and leaves them in their desperate condition to perish, they amuse us with words, and attempt to establish a distinction without a difference: for "Quos Deus præterit, reprobat." A decree of preterition is, to all intents and purposes, a decree of damnation, since every person who is absolutely excluded from the decree of election must infallibly be damned.*

It is, indeed, highly deserving of attention that, whatever opinion different men may form of the value of the Calvinistic system of theology, its admirable consistency with itself must be universally admitted. Its characteristic doctrines hang so closely together, and depend so essentially upon one another, that, if you remove a single dogma, you demolish the whole. Thus if you deny election, you must deny reprobation, and vice versâ. If you reject unconditional decrees, both election and reprobation fall to the ground. He who does not allow of invincible grace, must abandon the final perseverance of the saints. The result is the same, wherever you begin.

---

* The Calvinistic notion of reprobation seems not only to derive no support from the word which, in the New Testament, is rendered *Reprobate*, but even to be totally inconsistent with its real import. Ἀδόκιμος is *useless, of no value*; therefore *good for nothing but to be thrown away*. Its proper and original application is to the dross or scoriæ of metals. According to the scheme of those who think that the everlasting destiny of men is, in some way, dependent on their characters, it conveys a most significant, and most instructive intimation. The wicked have abused all the means of grace: they have shewn themselves incapable of improvement: they are only a nuisance in the creation of God: they are, therefore, fit subjects for being *reprobated*, that is, rejected, treated as vile, and cast away. "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground." On the principle of unconditional decrees, all this important and highly interesting instruction is lost.

Every

Every tenet of the ſyſtem is neceſſary to the ſupport of every other. We have therefore ſaid, that no man can (conſiſtently at leaſt) be a Calviniſt by halves: and to talk, as Mr. O. does, of a *moderate Calviniſm* is, in fact, to talk of a *real non-entity*.

We have long remarked, indeed, that it is a common artifice with writers of a certain deſcription to garble this precious ſyſtem of divinity, and to exhibit only a partial view of it. They either entirely keep out of ſight its moſt prominent and hideous, though eſſential, tenets; or, if they are forced to bring them forward, they boldly deny that they admit them: though what is thus diſclaimed as neceſſarily follows from what is admitted, as any corollary of Euclid from the propoſition from which it is deduced. This conduct, however, we cannot but regard as extremely diſingenuous, and unworthy of ſincere inquirers after truth. We are not ignorant of the rule of controverſy which forbids us to aſcribe to an antagoniſt thoſe conſequences of his opinions which he diſavows. But this rule can, in equitable conſtruction, have place only in caſes where theſe conſequences were either not foreſeen, or not pointed out. That our author ſtood in this predicament, no man who reads his book will believe. But, if Mr. O. chooſes to be inconſiſtent; if he will ſtill inſiſt on his privilege of making what reſervations he pleaſes in favour of himſelf; of adopting and rejecting preciſely ſuch ſhreds of Calviniſm as he thinks will beſt ſuit the purpoſes of the party for which he writes: we think that the obſervations already made confer on us an equal or a better right to conclude, that if our Church inculcate the theology of Calvin, ſhe inculcates it in its genuine purity, and to its legitimate extent.

It may be proper here to inform our readers, that, to juſtify the propriety, or rather neceſſity, of his publication, Mr. O. alleges that thoſe heterodox writers whoſe opinions he controverts were the *aggreſſors*, and had attacked, not himſelf indeed, but his friends, with unprovoked malignity. (Pref. p. vi.) But even our reſpect for Mr. O. cannot reſtrain us from affirming, in the moſt unqualified manner, that this is a groſs and moſt ſhameful miſrepreſentation. It would be inſulting our readers to ſuppoſe them ignorant that it has always, and uniformly, been a ſtanding rule with perſons of Mr. O.'s principles, to abuſe and vilify both clergy and laity, who had ſenſe enough to reject the Calviniſtic doctrines. Were we to credit his inſinuation in another place, (p. 42,) we ſhould certainly ſuppoſe that his party had been violently aſſaulted by a hoſt of foes: for he talks of "*Many* of their aſſailants." But when we examine the fact, even as ſtated by himſelf, it appears that this formidable army of aſſailants conſiſts of about ſix or ſeven divines, with the conductors of the Britiſh Critic and of the Anti-Jacobin Review.

The conductors of the Britiſh Critic, our reſpectable co-adjutors in the cauſe of the Church of England and of Truth, are fully competent to their own defence. With reſpect to ourſelves, whoſe volumes we obſerve are often referred to by this apologiſt, we ſhall en-

deavour to ſettle the account between him and us at a future opportunity. Till then, we are perfectly ſatisfied with the company in which he has placed us; and, in the mean time, we thank him for ſome obliging expreſſions which (pp. 15, 16,) he has been pleaſed to employ with regard to us.

We have ſaid that our author is an artful advocate; and we foreſee that we ſhall frequently have occaſion to notice the wary and guarded caution with which he writes. This forms, indeed, a conſpicuous characteriſtic of his book; and he ſeems, at times, to carry it ſo far as to diſplay a kind of myſterious ambiguity, which, to ſpeak the truth, now and then puts on very much the ſemblance of jeſuitical equivocation, and of a conſciouſneſs of the badneſs of his cauſe. Of this exceſſive warineſs the following is an inſtance, which is the more remarkable as it relates to the very deſign of his publication, in explaining which an author ought ſurely, if any where, to be open, explicit, and ingenuous. Although in his title-page he profeſſes to apologize "for thoſe of the regular clergy of the eſtabliſhment who are ſometimes called evangelical miniſters," he ſoon diſcovers that he has taken upon himſelf too hazardous a taſk. He is evidently afraid that this deſcription of his clients is too extenſive and general: he, therefore, in Pref. p. v. takes care to reduce it within bounds ſufficiently narrow. "Nor will," ſays he, "the work become reſponſible for the doctrines of any perſons except thoſe for whom by *name* it undertakes." He has thus expreſsly reſerved to himſelf the privilege of defending juſt whom he pleaſes, and, by conſequence, of leaving to the vengeance of their adverſaries thoſe refractory brethren, however dear, who preſume, in any degree, to exceed or come ſhort of the ſtandard which he means to eſtabliſh. Obſerve then, reader, and mark it well, that the real and only defendant in this cauſe is JOHN OVERTON, A. B.*

To the foregoing reſtriction, indeed, the following ſhuffling qualification is ſubjoined; but it can be intended only for a blind, becauſe, in the author's particular ſituation, it is entirely deſtitute of meaning: "Few, however, it is believed, will be found of the denomination and deſcription in queſtion," that is, regular evangelical miniſters of the eſtabliſhment, "who will not cordially ſubſcribe to their ſentiments," the ſentiments of thoſe "for whom," to uſe his own phraſeology, Mr. O. "by *name* undertakes."

---

* From the general ſtile of his work we conclude that Mr. O. is a *clergyman*—by which our readers will underſtand us to mean that he is in epiſcopal orders. If ſo, we ſhould be glad to know why he has omitted to prefix the uſual and appropriate deſignation of REVEREND to his name. On this affected practice, which we are ſorry to ſee gaining ground, whether it be intended as a puritanical diſplay of "voluntary humility," or as a private ſign of fraternal affection for Calviniſtic methodiſts out of the church, we ſhall not ceaſe, wherever we meet with it, to impreſs our note of decided reprobation.

But

But *why* does Mr. O. believe so? *We* believe no such thing. All those, at least, who entertain the supralapsarian principles will openly and clamorously dissent. We have reason to think that the number of these among the regular clergy of the established church is still not inconsiderable; and Mr. O. knows that they too are SOMETIMES called evangelical ministers. At all events his extreme caution has, in the present instance, exposed him to the charge of most egregiously trifling with the public. When he wrote the following bold defiance, he probably expected that his readers would good-naturedly have forgotten the declaration in his preface. "And here our opponents are challenged to shew, by fair quotation, from the writings of any person here vindicated, any doctrine that *exceeds this standard*; any thing that in its natural tendency, and by fair construction, *means more* than what is plainly taught in our Articles, Homilies and Liturgy, and illustrated by the other writings, and known sentiments, of our reformers." (P. 292.) The challenge is, certainly, a curious one. Mr. O. undertakes to vindicate only those whom he mentions by name; persons who, to be sure, teach his own doctrines; and then gravely defies his opponents to produce, from the works of those persons, doctrines different from his! The individuals, however, whom he names with approbation make a pretty large assemblage.—He enumerates Robinson, Hervey, Milner, Venn, Hawker, Knox, Romaine, Cecil, Cadogan, *Scott of the Lock*, &c. &c. with Mr. Wilberforce, and *that prodigy of female understanding* (p. 317) Mrs. Hannah More. The list is indeed so large, that we must decline taking up Mr. O.'s gauntlet. We are either too indolent, or too busy, to enter into a minute examination of the voluminous productions of these worthy champions of the True Churchmen, although, by such an examination, we should, no doubt, be greatly edified and instructed. We shall, therefore, give full credit to Mr. O.'s assertion, and firmly believe that there is not the shadow of a disagreement between their theological notions and his.

But the question at issue between our author and his opponents is the REAL SENSE of the authorized standards of the doctrines of our church. Mr. O. insists that they go the length of Sublapsarian Calvinism at least, and often intimates that those do not, in his apprehension, misinterpret them, who represent them as going still farther. We are most decidedly of a different opinion. He has brought, indeed, many arguments to prove that our reformers were Calvinists. But granting that *some*, or even *many* of them were Calvinists, in the most extensive sense of the word; it would not follow that our public standards are therefore Calvinistic. This point is to be determined on other principles, and by a different criterion. This criterion, we are happy to observe, Mr. O. has fairly and fully proposed: we, therefore, quote with pleasure the passage in which it is laid down.

"The Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our Church are three distinct species

ſpecies of writings. They were compoſed at different times, and, in ſome reſpects, for different purpoſes. And yet, in point of doctrine, they uniformly breathe the ſame ſpirit, and expreſs themſelves with the ſame degree of force. No one of them contracts the ideas, or by any means leſſens the import, of the reſt; but, when compared with honeſty, and underſtood according to the common rules of interpreting written compoſitions, each mutually illuſtrates and confirms the full and natural ſenſe of the others. In this light they were uniformly conſidered by the great characters who reviewed and examined them at their firſt eſtabliſhment; and whatever may have been urged to the contrary from a few *detached paſſages*, he muſt be a very ſuperficial theologian, who conſiders them *thoroughly*, and does not perceive the ſame *exact harmony* in them now. To the great diſturbance of ſuch divines as Archdeacon Paley, the doctrines of the articles are 'woven with much induſtry into the forms of public worſhip.'—This circumſtance, therefore, muſt materially aſſiſt us in diſcovering the original ſenſe and intention of the *whole*, and leaves little room to doubt but it was that which is moſt obviouſly ſuggeſted by the *words*, when underſtood according to the common uſe of language applied to ſuch ſubjects." (P. 45.)

With all this, which is well and ſenſibly ſaid, we moſt cordially agree, and here join iſſue with our apologiſt. Indeed the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of the Church muſt neceſſarily have been meant to be in harmony with each other, unleſs we will ſuppoſe our reformers to have been deſtitute either of common underſtanding or of common integrity. If they poſſeſſed the former, they could not draw up, as ſtandards of orthodoxy, three inſtruments ſtamped with equal authority, of which the doctrines were diſcordant and irreconcileable: nor could they, if not devoid of the latter, intend that the clergy, in ſubſcribing the Articles, ſhould make profeſſion of a different faith from what it is their daily duty to profeſs, and inculcate on the people, in the public Liturgy. We know not what diſturbance it may give to ſuch divines as Mr. Archdeacon Paley, that the doctrines of the articles are "woven with ſo much induſtry into the forms of public worſhip;" but, for our ſhare, we ſincerely rejoice that ſuch is the caſe. We could have wiſhed indeed that Mr. O. who has undoubtedly compared, with *care and honeſty*, the offices of the Liturgy with the Articles and Homilies, had favoured us with a particular detail of the reſults which he muſt have found on ſuch compariſon. But as, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, he has not thought this incumbent upon him, we muſt endeavour, for the ſake of our readers, in ſome degree to ſupply the defect; and we begin with inquiring whether the Liturgy teaches the doctrines of Calvin: for if it does not, then neither do the Articles or Homilies, our learned apologiſt himſelf being judge.

Now the key ſtone of the whole Calviniſtic ſyſtem is the doctrine of unconditional decrees, on the removal of which the whole edifice inſtantly tumbles into ruins. Even the mild and moderate Calviniſm for which our author pleads, and which he anxiouſly contends to

be

be the doctrine of the Church, is built on an arbitrary election of individuals, without any regard to the character and conduct of the persons elected. (See p. 354.) "And what scheme," he asks, "does so much honour to the character and government of the Supreme Being as that which represents him as aiming continually at the manifestation of his own glorious perfections, and the greatest possible ultimate felicity of his creatures; as accomplishing these ends by means concerted in wisdom and goodness; permitting *partial* evil, in order to greater good; leaving his intelligent creatures to be influenced by motives which are certain in their effects, but which destroy not the moral responsibility of the agent?" (P. 255.) Our reformers, he had told us before, "wished unequivocally to teach that man's *salvation* is *wholly of grace*, but that his *perdition* is of himself; and neither to make *God the author of sin*, nor *man a mere machine*, and unfit to be treated as *a moral agent*." (P. 95.) But if our reformers wished indeed to teach so, they must have believed election to be conditional, and dependent on men's use of the grace afforded them; for on no other possible scheme of election *can man be other than a mere machine*, be *made responsible for his own perdition*, or *considered as a moral agent*. But *conditional election* necessarily supposes *universal redemption*, and that every man's future happiness is in his own power; since if man's salvation is suspended on his compliance with the influences of divine grace, a sufficient portion of that grace must be proffered equally to all. On this important subject, however, Mr. Overton speaks in the following cold and equivocal manner: "They," the reformers, "do not use the language it," Calvin's work, "does respecting the extent of Christ's redemption." (P. 94.) Mr. O. knew that they really use language diametrically opposite. But he also knew that if the doctrine that Christ died for all men be the doctrine of the Church, he must abandon either the church or his favourite tenet of unconditional election, and all its consequences.

Now, in the form of daily absolution, the priest is made authoritatively to pronounce that "God desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live." But can God desire that those should live, who, in consequence of his decree of prætérition, are left by him in a state which inevitably leads to eternal death? The petition in the Litany, "That it may please thee to have mercy upon all men," is absolutely and totally inconsistent with Calvinism, in all its modifications and forms. For whether those who shall be finally miserable are condemned by a positive or negative decree; are reprobated, as they say, or only passed by; their salvation is impossible: and it is only a solemn mockery of God to pray that he would have mercy on them. The same observation is equally applicable to the language employed in the commencement of the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church: "Almighty and everlasting God, who, by thy holy apostle, hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks, for

all

all men." In the Collect for Aſh Wedneſday, we addreſs our Maker as a Being "who hateth *nothing* that he hath made;" words which ſurely quadrate ill with the ſentiments of thoſe who believe that the means of ſalvation are denied, by an arbitrary, unconditional decree, to a great proportion of the human race. In that for the Sunday next before Eaſter, God is affirmed "of his tender love to mankind to have ſent his Son, our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, to take upon him our fleſh, and to ſuffer death upon the croſs," and that for this end, "that all mankind ſhould follow the example of his great humility." But it is obvious that, on the Calviniſtic ſcheme, whether Supralapſarian or Sublapſarian, the affirmation is falſe, and the end impoſſible. Both reprobation and præterition neceſſarily ſuppoſe that for a great part of mankind God had no tender love, and that ſuch part can never follow Chriſt's example. In the firſt Collect for Good Friday, *every* Chriſtian congregation is directed to ſay "Almighty God, we beſeech thee graciouſly to behold *this* thy family, *for which* our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was contented to be betrayed, and given up into the hands of wicked men, and to ſuffer death upon the croſs;" expreſſions which have no meaning unleſs all men have it in their power to become partakers of the ineſtimable benefits of the death of Chriſt. The ſame concluſion may be inferred from the collects for the 4th and 13th Sundays after Trinity, in the firſt of which *all Chriſtians* are taught to pray "that they may ſo paſs through things temporal that they *finally loſe not* the things eternal;" and in the ſecond "that they may ſo faithfully ſerve God in this life, that they *fail not finally* to attain his heavenly promiſes."

But we are not left to collect, by inference, that our Church holds the doctrine of univerſal redemption, and, by conſequence, that of conditional election, which totally overthrow Mr. O.'s ſcheme. She teaches them in terms as plain and unambiguous as the language can ſupply. Thus ſhe makes us, in the general Thankſgiving, give God "moſt humble and hearty thanks for all his goodneſs and loving kindneſs to *us* and to *all men*; to bleſs him, above all things, for his ineſtimable love in the redemption," not of a ſelect number of perſons arbitrarily and unconditionally choſen, but "*of the world* by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt:" who, in the prayer of conſecration at the communion, is affirmed to have "made, by his one oblation of himſelf once offered, a full, perfect, and ſufficient ſacrifice, oblation and ſatisfaction for *the ſins of the whole world*." The Catechiſm which ſhe enjoins to be learned of all her children, and in which ſhe ſurely lays down with plainneſs and perſpicuity the religious principles which ſhe wiſhes them to adopt, inſtructs the catechumen, in reply to the queſtion "What doſt thou chiefly learn in theſe articles of thy belief?" to anſwer, among other things, "In God the Son, who hath redeemed me and *all mankind*." Nay, as if all this were not ſufficiently deciſive of her ſentiments on ſo important a point, ſhe has taken care, in her thirty-firſt Article, to declare them formally, in terms

ſo

ſo clear and comprehenſive, ſo emphatical and preciſe, that we ſhould be greatly obliged to Mr. O. or any of his friends, if they would inform us how to couch the doctrine of univerſal redemption in words more expreſſive of its nature and extent. "The offering of Chriſt once made," ſays the Article, "is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and ſatisfaction for ALL THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD, BOTH ORIGINAL AND ACTUAL." This unlucky declaration we boldly pronounce to be *crux Calviniſtarum*; and unleſs, in his *honeſt compariſon* of the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, it, by ſome moſt unaccountable fatality, eſcaped Mr. O.'s eye, we muſt be content to run the riſque of his diſpleaſure, by *honeſtly* and roundly telling him that to charge the Church of England with teaching the Calviniſtic tenet of a partial, arbitrary, and unconditional election of individuals to eternal life, required a degree of impudence equal, at leaſt, to his other powers.

Nor are we at all afraid to meet this dextrous controverſialiſt, this redoubted champion of Sublapſarian Calviniſm, on the ſubject of the famous XVIIth Article, which is uniformly appealed to in the preſent diſpute. For our own part, we never could perceive in this article the ſhadow of a difficulty. We have always thought, and continue to think, it completely anti-Calviniſtic. Indeed, to let our readers into a ſecret, we ſhrewdly ſuſpect that Mr. O. thinks ſo too; nor ſhall we be much ſurprized if, after peruſing the following quotation, which, though ſomewhat long, we cannot abridge, and of which, regarding it as a curious ſpecimen of the art of confutation, we were unwilling to deprive them, ſome of them ſhould be inclined to entertain the ſame ſuſpicion with ourſelves.

"There is, however," ſays Mr. O. "it muſt be confeſſed, a diſcovery made by Mr. Daubeny, which, if it be juſt, forms a conſiderable objection to our concluſion." "But, Sir," ſays this writer to his opponent, "I ſhall not do juſtice to the 17th Article, if I do not obſerve further, that, ſo far from being intended to favour the *Calviniſtic doctrine*, it appears to me to furniſh the MOST DECISIVE INTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST IT." Poor deluded hiſtorians, ancient and modern, foreign and domeſtic, who, with one voice, have told us that our public confeſſions are formed on the *Auguſtinian*, or *Calvinian* plan! Poor unfortunate Biſhop Burnet, who, when employed by his Queen, and the great metropolitan, for the very oppoſite purpoſe, has ſaid, "It is not to be denied but that the Article ſeems to be framed according to St. Auſtin's doctrine;" that although, in his judgment, *others* might ſubſcribe it, yet that "the *Calviniſts have leſs occaſion for ſcruple*, ſince the *Article does ſeem more plainly to favour them*;" and that the very "cautions that are added to it, do likewiſe intimate that St. Auſtin's doctrine was deſigned to be ſettled by the Article!" Poor good-natured Arminians, who have made ſo many undue *conceſſions*, and have *ſo laboured to account* for this circumſtance; aſcribing it to the Marian exile, and a deſire to comprehend

hend the Calviniſts, and to the fact that "ſome of the compilers of the articles were Calviniſts!" Poor ſhort-ſighted ſimpletons altogether, who, for *two hundred and thirty-ſeven years* have been doting about the *Calviniſtic tendency* of our articles, when, after all, the *very article upon which this point has been chiefly founded, furniſhes the* MOST DECISIVE EVIDENCE AGAINST IT! Well may Mr. Daubeny be repreſented as "indiſputably the *very foremoſt*, or *among the foremoſt*, writers of the age!" Well may it be triumphantly concluded that Calviniſts will hardly attempt to *reaſon* with him!" With the man, who can view ſuch an article in ſuch a light, conſidered under all its circumſtances, and in connection with what has been the prevailing opinion of perſons of all perſuaſions upon it, it is certainly in vain to reaſon." (P. 93.)

When this extraordinary paſſage met our eye, we inſtantly conjectured that Mr. O. had found, upon this occaſion, Mr. D.'s armour impenetrable. It is not in a ſtile like this that a keen and able diſputant writes when he is really perſuaded that his adverſary lies at his mercy. Accordingly, on conſulting the "Appendix to the Guide to the Church," we were fully convinced of the juſtneſs of our conjecture. We again moſt earneſtly recommend to the attention of our readers the whole of that incomparable production, eſpecially Letter 4th, where, if we have not entirely loſt our faculty of judging, they will find ſuch proofs of the Anti-Calviniſm of the 17th article, as the whole brigade of "Evangelical miniſters," whether regular or irregular, *male* or *female*, of the eſtabliſhment or out of the eſtabliſhment, will never be able to overturn.

The 2d ſection of the 2d chapter of Mr. O'.s book, is entitled, "The true Interpretation of the Articles further ſought from the known private Sentiments of our Reformers." Theſe ſentiments, he ſays, he means to ſhew were thoſe which are now uſually termed Calviniſtic; and his firſt proof of this poſition is deduced from "the UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY of men of all ſentiments, and," reader, mark! "*of the utmoſt reſpectability.*" His witneſſes, indeed, are not deficient in number; though, with regard to the *reſpectability* of ſome of them, at leaſt, as well as to their competence to give evidence in this cauſe, a court properly conſtituted might poſſibly be inclined to heſitate. We are preſented, however, with the depoſitions, at large, of the hiſtorians HUME, Robertſon, and Moſheim, of the *Critical Reviewers*, of Biſhop Burnet, and of the CONDUCTORS OF THE NEW ANNUAL REGISTER. "The ſame, in effect," adds the author, "ſay Maclaine, Strype, Wilſon, Smollet, and numberleſs others." The learned author of the Confeſſional "too is referred to; and what credit is not due to the venerable teſtimony of Davenant, Carleton, Hall, Ward, Uſher,* Whitaker, and the whole claſs of

* Mr. O. may poſſibly ſomewhere have ſeen that this very learned man, at one time a zealous ſupporter of the moſt rigid Calviniſm, ſolemnly renounced

of writers of their deſcription?" (P. 72.) Having firſt duly commented on this great body of evidence, Mr. O. triumphantly demands a verdict. "And what now, we aſk, but the irreſiſtible force of truth, could induce men of ſuch oppoſite principles"—all, you will remember, *of the utmoſt reſpectability*—all honourable men—"and in ſuch oppoſite ſituations, Believers and INFIDELS, Churchmen and DISSENTERS, Natives and FOREIGNERS, CALVINISTS and Arminians, thus to unite in their teſtimony on the point? Muſt we not ceaſe to expect any authentic information from hiſtory, if, to a conſiderable extent, credit is not due to ſuch evidence as this?" (P. 73.)

By a certain claſs of readers, for whom it was deſigned, all this will, no doubt, be reckoned very concluſive. But τι προς Διονυσον? Had Mr. O. critically analyſed the 17th article, and ſhewn that, in fair conſtruction, it cannot be reconciled to the Arminian ſcheme, his procedure would have been directly to the purpoſe; and he would have done more to prove our formularies Calviniſtic, than can be done by the teſtimony of ten thouſand ſuch witneſſes as he has produced: of whom ſome may be juſtly ſuſpected to have been but indifferent judges of the ſubject, whilſt almoſt all of them were intereſted in fixing the charge, either as avowed friends to the doctrine, or as profeſſed enemies to the Church of England. Our author, however, has thought proper to honour this important article with very little of his notice. After miſerably mangling, perverting, and miſrepreſenting a remarkable paſſage of the illuſtrious Hooper, he ſays, "The whole therefore that this famous paſſage can be made to inculcate, is the propriety of guarding againſt the *exceſſes* and *abuſes* of the doctrines of Predeſtination and Election; and the *proper manner* of treating on the ſubject; namely, that we muſt argue from the effect to the cauſe, and only infer our election from our Chriſtian experience and conduct. And preciſely the ſame," he afterwards adds, "might be ſhewn of *all* that is ſo generally quoted by writers of an Arminian caſt, from the works of Melancthon, Latimer, Hall, the Reformatio Legum, and the laſt clauſe of the 17th Article. The paſſages contain nothing more than ſome *ſalutary cautions* againſt the *abuſes* or *miſrepreſentation* of the Calviniſtic doctrines, of which cautions every prudent Calviniſt fully admits the propriety." (Pp. 90, 91.)

That Mr. O. is, or at leaſt intends to be, a *very prudent* Calviniſt, we are ready to allow: indeed we have conſpicuous proofs of it in almoſt every page of his book. We alſo allow that the laſt clauſe of the 17th Article was intended to guard againſt the *abuſes of the doctrines of Predeſtination and Election.* But when Mr. O. aſſerts, that it "contains nothing more than a ſalutary *caution againſt the abuſes of the* CALVINISTIC DOCTRINES," we beg leave to remind him that

---

nounced that ſyſtem before his death. But we beg Mr O.'s pardon; as this fact did not come within his plan, he was not, of courſe, obliged to notice it.

his

his assertion is gratuitous, and built on a gross and disingenuous *petitio principii*. Mr O must know that, to render this assertion of any validity, he ought to have proved that the predestination taught in the article is *Calvinistic predestination*; *absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional*. But this, we are confident, he cannot prove; for there is nothing in the words of the article itself, when taken in their *literal* and *grammatical* sense, which gives the smallest countenance to such a notion. We have always conceived that, in drawing up this article, our Reformers had the words of St Paul (Rom. viii. 29, 30.) immediately in view: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." The article, indeed, it will be acknowledged, has the appearance of being a very exact paraphrase of the Apostle's language. But supposing that St. Paul, in this place, is treating of the predestination of individuals, as such, to eternal salvation, (of which, however, we think that there is great reason to doubt) nothing can be clearer than that his predestination is not arbitrary and absolute; for he expressly founds it on the *foreknowledge of God*.* At all events, if our Reformers meant,

* In the whole of our reasoning about predestination, we took it for granted that Mr. O. and his friends hold unconditional election, which we always conceived, indeed, to be an essential part of the sublapsarian scheme. But it seems, after all, that we were deceived. He notices, it is true, as liable to objection, the Bishop of Lincoln's opinion on the subject; of whom it is said (p. 354.) that "IN OPPOSITION TO THE CALVINISTS, he represents predestination as *founded on* FORESEEN OBEDIENCE." This we were simple enough to consider as most unexceptionable *positive* evidence that the Calvinists DO NOT found predestination on foreseen obedience. But our readers are not even yet sufficiently acquainted with the versatile talents of our ingenious apologist, who can, at any time, by a motion of his magical wand, make his party instantly embrace or renounce the most important doctrines, just as best promotes the particular purpose which he has then in view. We must acknowledge, however, that notwithstanding the numerous proofs which we had remarked of his singular dexterity in managing an argument, we were perfectly confounded, and, for some time, could hardly persuade ourselves that we were awake, when, after having nearly finished our observations on this extraordinary production, the following passage, referring expressly, as appears from the margin, to Rom. viii. 29, 30. accidentally met our eye. "Our uniform doctrine is, that all whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be *conformed to the image of his son*, and to walk religiously in good works." (P. 295.) From this it would seem, to our apprehension, that our author, and his evangelical brethren, DO found predestination on *foreseen obedience*; and that, therefore, on this point, there is no disagreement between them, his Lordship of Lincoln, and ourselves. If there be, M. O. would do us a favour if he would inform us what he here

meant, in the body of the article, to inculcate the tenets of unconditional election, their subsequent caution is not only useless, but perfectly absurd. "We must receive," say they, "God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture: and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God." Now it would be superfluous to multiply quotations in order to demonstrate that the promises of God, as set forth in Scripture, are all general and conditional. "God will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath; tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. For there is no respect of persons with God." (Rom. ii. 6—11.) It were also needless to accumulate proofs that the Redemption purchased by the death of Christ is represented, in Scripture, as extending to the whole human race. The parallel which is drawn by St. Paul, (Rom. v. 15—19.) between the effects of Adam's transgression and those of our Saviour's satisfaction, is full to the point. The same Apostle expressly affirms (1. Tim. ii. 6.) that "Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom *for all*;" St. John (1. Ep. ii. 2.) that "he is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*;" and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (ii. 9.) that he "tasted death for *every man*." If, therefore, as our Apologist conceives, and as we conceive likewise, "Our established forms exhibit the plain and genuine doctrines of the Scriptures," (p. 368.) the election taught in the 17th article is *conditional* election; not the election of certain individuals, without regard to their character and conduct; but of all those of whom God foresaw that they would believe, and obey the gospel. If this was the doctrine of our Reformers, their caution in the conclusion of the article, is pertinent, sensible, and to this effect:

"The Lord knoweth them that are his; for though the gracious terms of salvation, through Christ, are offered to all men, yet all will not accept

---

here understands by the *foreknowledge of God*. He cannot, we presume, in this place, confine it to the *natural and simple attribute of* PRESCIENCE: for that were to charge the Apostle with uttering not only nonsense, but blasphemy. It were not only making him say that the divine prescience extended to those who shall be saved, which is nothing to the purpose, since we know that it extended, in an equal degree, to those who shall be saved, and to those who shall be damned: but also that those who shall be damned were predestinated by God "to be conformed to the image of his son, to be called, justified, and glorified." But we leave it to Mr. O. to adjust, at leisure, his sentiments on the subject.

"Quo teream vultus mutantem Protea nodo?"

them. But thoſe who do, He, who ſeeth the end from the beginning, hath conſtantly decreed to bring to eternal felicity. This decree, however, makes no alteration in the duty or deſtiny of any individual. Let none, therefore, think that they are, by it, excluded from the benefits of the redemption through Chriſt. Everlaſting happineſs is promiſed, in Scripture, to every man who will fulfil the conditions on which the promiſe is made. Hence, although we may not be able to perceive how the certain foreknowledge of a future event is to be reconciled with its contingency; yet we are not, therefore, to remit of our exertions: ſince we certainly know from the word of God, that our final ſalvation depends on theſe exertions, and that none will be ultimately miſerable but through their own fault."

Let us now ſuppoſe that the predeſtination taught in the article, is the ſame with that of our author and his friends, the moderate Sublapſarian Calviniſts, and, in that caſe, obſerve the reaſoning of the Church.

"The Supreme Being hath, from all eternity, conſtantly decreed, from the maſs of mankind to ſelect a part, in conſequence of which they ſhall infallibly be ſaved. The reſt he hath as conſtantly decreed to leave in a ſtate of wrath and damnation, in conſequence of which they muſt infallibly periſh. But in theſe decrees of election and preterition, no reſpect is had to the characters of the perſons; to the foreſeen faith and obedience of the one claſs, or to the foreſeen infidelity and diſobedience of the other. Although, however, the divine decrees are thus arbitrary and abſolute; although all our endeavours to work out our ſalvation are uſeleſs and nugatory, becauſe thoſe who are not comprehended in the number of the elect cannot poſſibly be ſaved; yet the word of God has expreſsly aſſured us, by making all its promiſes conditional and general, that every man may be ſaved if he will. We muſt, therefore, receive theſe promiſes as true, though we know them to be falſe; and act upon them in our conduct through life, though our actions are of no manner of conſequence one way or other."

This is the legitimate import of the doctrine which even Mr. O.'s moderate principles would attach to our venerable Church; and we appeal to every reader of ſenſe, whether any doctrine can be imagined more abſurd or impious.

The doctrine, indeed, of abſolute decrees, in every light in which it can be viewed, is attended with conſequences which are equally at variance with the deductions of reaſon, the known courſe of providence, and the uniform tenor of revealed religion. How contingent events, which depend upon the will of free moral agents, can be certainly foreſeen, we have, it is true, no faculties to underſtand. It has, indeed, been well obſerved, that *predeſtination*, *preſcience*, *election*, &c. are words accommodated to human capacities, and cannot, in a ſtrict or proper ſenſe, be predicated of God; for with him there is neither *paſt* nor *future*: all things are *preſent*. But the truth is, that of the *natural* attributes of God, as they have been called, ſuch as his *eternity*, *omnipreſence*, &c. we comprehend almoſt nothing; and, therefore, whenever we attempt to ſcan them, our reaſon is apt to be bewildered and loſt. But, with regard to his *moral* attributes, the caſe

is widely different. We are certain that, in God, *juſtice*, *veracity*, *goodneſs*, and *mercy*, though infinitely higher in *degree*, are the ſame in *kind* with what they are in ourſelves. Of theſe, therefore, we have clear and diſtinct ideas; and we can argue from them with ſafety and preciſion. Were it not ſo, the ſituation of man would be an ænigma altogether inexplicable; and to talk of a moral government of the univerſe were nothing better than downright nonſenſe. Now the Calviniſtic tenet of abſolute decrees is deſtructive both of the juſtice, and of the goodneſs of God. It is juſtice to puniſh the wicked, as well as to reward the righteous. But that being cannot poſſibly be juſt who diſpenſes happineſs and miſery by caprice: nor can he be either juſt or merciful, who, when a ranſom has been paid him for the deliverance of a thouſand priſoners, chuſes, for no other reaſon but the gratification of his own whim, to condemn five hundred of them to dungeons and to death. In the ordinary œconomy of human affairs relating to the buſineſs of the preſent life, we know from the beſt of all evidence, that of experience, that, without induſtry, and the exertion of our own powers, no great or valuable acquiſition is, in general, to be expected. Though every bleſſing which men enjoy is rightly conſidered as the bountiful effect of divine beneficence; yet the labourer or mechanic were an abſolute madman who ſhould truſt to providence for the ſupply of his wants, whilſt he paſſed his time in habitual idleneſs. We are taught, indeed, to pray for our daily bread; but we may chance to ſtarve if we do not work for it. The caſe is the ſame in what concerns our everlaſting intereſts. The redemption of the world, by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is truly repreſented, in Scripture, as a ſcheme of free and unmerited grace; but, although it be true that "by grace we are ſaved," we muſt yet "work out our own ſalvation with fear and trembling, giving all diligence to make our calling and election ſure." It could not poſſibly, indeed, have been otherwiſe, ſuppoſing this world a ſtate of probation, and man, a moral, accountable creature, the proper ſubject of reward and puniſhment.

(To be continued.)

A Tour through ſeveral of the Midland and Weſtern Departments of France, in the Months of June, July, Auguſt, and September, 1802, *with Remarks on the Manners, Cuſtoms, and Agriculture of the Country.* By the Rev. W. Hughes. 8vo. Pp. 246. 6s. Oſtell. 1803.

EVERY book which tends to convey *true* and *juſt* information reſpecting the actual ſtate of France, muſt be conſidered as forming an acceptable addition to our general ſtock of uſeful knowledge; but we have to lament that hitherto the taſk of conveying ſuch information has not been undertaken by any one (as far as we know) who knew that country in its priſtine ſtate, and who, from

ſuch knowledge, would be enabled to direct his inquiries with better effect, and to give a comparative view, of a nature highly intereſting, inſtructive, and important. The intelligence which Mr. Hughes attempts to communicate to his readers has little to recommend it either from its novelty or its uſefulneſs; it contains little to amuſe and ſtill leſs to inſtruct; and it is ſo enveloped in affectation and ſelf-conſequence, as to be extremely offenſive and diſguſting. The pert flippancy of the author's ſtile, contraſted with his dogmatical tone of deciſion, exhibits a ſtrange mixture, that might indeed excite a laugh, if all propenſity to mirth were not forcibly reſtrained by indignation, at a perpetual recurrence of ignorance, vanity, miſrepreſentation, and injuſtice.

The firſt inſtance of miſrepreſentation and injuſtice occurs in the deſcription of the firſt town reached by Mr. H. on the coaſt of France. Dieppe, he deſcribes, and we dare ſay with great truth, as the moſt miſerable of all miſerable places; "Spiders," he ſays, "and vermin of a hundred different ſorts, have tenanted, undiſturbed, every corner; and the accumulated filth of generations, long ſince mouldering in the duſt, almoſt renders the glaſs impervious: in ſhort, the *tout-enſemble* is poverty in the extreme." But leſt any one ſhould be led from this horrid picture to deduce any conſequences unfavourable to the revolution, he immediately aſſures us, with a confidence uniformly diſplayed in exact proportion to his own ignorance of the ſubject, that "to account for all this, we muſt look to a higher ſource than the revolution. It is, by no means, the effect of any thing modern; it is the reſult of abuſes which flouriſhed under the Bourbons; but, for the oppreſſions of the antient government, there is no reaſon to be aſſigned why an Engliſh port ſhould bear the aſpect of *comfort*, a French port the aſpect of *miſery*." What theſe abuſes, and theſe oppreſſions were, which rendered the inhabitants of Dieppe ſo filthy and ſqualid in their habitations, this *intelligent* traveller has left us to conjecture. It might have occurred, we ſhould think, to a leſs confident writer than Mr. H. that the *abuſes* and *oppreſſions* of the laſt twelve years were as well calculated to check the ſpirit of commercial enterprize, to deſtroy all habits of induſtry, and to palſy the exertions of the people in every reſpect, as any abuſes or oppreſſions which could have exiſted before. But to put an end to his ingenious hypotheſis by a plain matter of fact, we can aſſure him, that in the year 1786, when one of the Bourbons occupied the throne of France, the town of Dieppe exhibited a very different appearance to that which is here given of it; the place itſelf was (with an exception as to one particular) as neat and clean a ſea-port as we recollect to have ſeen in France, and the *oppreſſed* inhabitants were as gay, lively, and contented, as any race of beings with whom we ever aſſociated or converſed. We were ſorry to find this ſame ſpirit of miſrepreſentation pervading the greater part of the book; and a conſtant effort on the part of the author to juſtify the regicides at the expence of their

ſovereign.

ſovereign. Rouen, if his deſcription of it be accurate, is nearly as much altered as Dieppe.

Mr. H. juſtifies the plunder of the Church, and though a prieſt himſelf, ſeems to think the robbery of eccleſiaſtics no crime. If he had condeſcended to point out the difference between the validity of lay property, and that of church property, he would, at leaſt, have acted more conſiſtently, than by a gratuitous juſtification of plunder, on the jacobinical plea, urged in the language of *Golden Lane*, (one ſubject of his elegant compariſons) in which he appears to be a proficient; that the property ſo ſeized was that "of which quaking guilt and credulity had been *gulled.*" It is but juſtice, however, to obſerve, that with all this prejudice againſt eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments of every deſcription, and with all his malevolent invectives againſt the Roman Catholic clergy, he decidedly prefers the *ſlaves of popery*, as he calls the French before the revolution, to the *ſlaves of the philoſophers* as he terms them ſince that epoch.

"The Frenchmen, as long as the *Ancien Regime* endured, were men of gentleneſs and urbanity—from the moment they fell into the hands of the modern ſage philoſophers they became dæmons—ſlaves of popery: many an amiable virtue endeared them to ſurrounding nations, and prompted the ſigh as often as their degradation became the ſubject of reflection—the ſlaves of the philoſophers, not a ſolitary qualification remained, to ſoften the ſhade of the enormities they hourly perpetrated—from objects of pity, they became the objects of univerſal hatred and deteſtation. Humanity is indeed *returning*—order and decency *begin* to raiſe their perſecuted heads again; in the provinces they will flouriſh with recruited vigour. At Rouen it will be long ere the happy change takes place; the preſent generation muſt firſt wear away."

And again,

"As might be expected, the diſpoſition of the inferior orders has been but little meliorated by the revolution: the perverſe and prepoſterous notions of equality with which the abettors of anarchy and deſpotiſm combined to din their ears, have completely poiſoned the antient French mildneſs and urbanity, and their rudeneſs and incivility are intolerably offenſive."

As conſiſtency, however, is not an indiſpenſible qualification in a modern touriſt, any more than in a modern philoſopher, we find, though humanity was only *returning* in *June*, when Mr. H. began his tour, that *order* and *decency* were then only *beginning* to raiſe their perſecuted heads, and though, at a ſubſequent period, even the *antient French mildneſs and urbanity* were *completely poiſoned*, yet before the completion of his philoſophical excurſion in September, ſuch was the rapidity of their progreſs, that they had totally recovered their health, had actually eſtabliſhed their reign, and were in poſſeſſion of plenary power.

"The French are, upon the whole, an amiable people—there is an urbanity—a good nature—a readineſs to oblige which is highly intereſting—

politeneſs and ſuavity of manners, in other countries confined to the elevated, ranks of life, here pervade, with few exceptions only, every ſituation, every profeſſion—they are mild and gentle—affable and eaſy—as deſirous to pleaſe as to be pleaſed. I know, that what we call *excess* of civility, becauſe we are rather unaccuſtomed to it, throws a doubtful caſt upon their candour—our cunning trading ſpirit, which judges every man by itſelf, and ſuſpects the generoſity, to which we are ſtrangers, to be nothing leſs than deeper cunning ſtill, attributes their guiltleſs honeſty to inſincerity, to French *politesse*—every profeſſion is *palaver*, the mere empty breath of compliment, which will expire in froth and ſmoke. For my part, I muſt enter my moſt ſolemn proteſt againſt ſuch a conſtruction of their poliſhed civility—it is a calumny as groundleſs as it is injurious and unjuſt."

It is a pity the author did not give us ſome account of the wonderful proceſs by which dæmons are thus ſpeedily converted into ſocial angels. But all this is mere harmleſs folly compared with the miſchievous ſpirit which occaſionally diſplays itſelf in ſome parts of his book. One inſtance will ſuffice; let our readers recollect that it is the *Reverend* W. Hughes who ſpeaks. The ſubject is the profligacy that prevails in manufacturing towns.

"What are the antidotes by which the poiſon is to be corrected? We anſwer, complete religious liberty. Legiſlators have enacted pains and penalties for this and the other irregularity and vice; and what has been the effect? Nothing.—Abſolutely nothing. Well then—if the ſecular Aaron cannot preſerve the morals of the people from contamination, let them try what religion will do; for in vain do they attempt to make good citizens without it.—Let them give equal countenance to as many as are diſpoſed to enter the abodes of ſqualid wretchedneſs to attack vice, even in its ſeat of empire—to warn the thoughtleſs, to confirm the wavering, to reclaim the wanderer, to edify the virtuous; in a word, to plant the ſeeds of moral purity in the heart, and cheriſh them by the ſanctions of the New Teſtament.—I ſay *equal* countenance, for every man has an equal right to form his creed for himſelf, and conſequently an equal right to the protection of the law.—If my principles make me a good citizen, the ſecular arm has nothing to do with me but to animate and encourage me in the proſecution of them. As long as I am taught by them to demean myſelf peaceably and orderly, and to ſet an example of ſocial virtue to the ſurrounding community, I have unqueſtionably a right to ſpeculate upon abſtract points as I pleaſe, and to get to heaven my own way; and if my ſpeculations, no matter how abſurd, are attended with the effect of ſnatching the vicious from their crimes, and reducing diſorder to temperance and ſobriety, I merit the applauſe, not the perſecution of the government, beneath which I live. I will not ſay, that the eſtabliſhed prieſt of the country cannot check the progreſs of vice as well as another, but I will ſay that others are far more likely to do it: no man bears conſtraint without writhing—from the moment you tell me that I muſt believe as the cheriſhed ſervant of the ſtate preſcribes, and reckon upon its protection and favour, but, as I obey him, from that moment I liſten to his inſtructions with ſuſpicion; I conſider him as an *hireling*, and his doctrines as ultimately contrived, not for my edification, but for the conſolidation of your empire over me—of courſe the impreſſion made upon my mind is faint and tranſient—the moſt impaſſioned perſuaſion melts

melts me not—the moſt terrific denunciations affright me not: in ſhort, I muſt be won by one who comes forward as my beloved Maſter did—whoſe principles are diſintereſted—whoſe *ſole* object is my edification and eternal happineſs. This is the man who muſt reclaim the vicious herds which the manufactories aſſemble together—who muſt arreſt them in their career of vice—humanize the ſavage and reduce him to the orderly diſcipline of the New Teſtament: within theſe forty years paſt, we have ſeen more accompliſhed in the work of public reformation by the efforts of two unaided individuals only, than by thoſe of a whole hierarchy combined. In our late troubles, we have ſeen alſo that the exertions of one reſpected individual only,* an individual on whom the ſmiles of favour never fell; nay, who was brow-beaten and depreſſed—could reſtrain the fierce impetuoſity of the Iriſh hordes aſſembled in the metropolis, and do more towards preſerving public peace and public order, than legions of eccleſiaſtics who had never given proof of their ſincerity. The concluſion is evident: let as many as are diſpoſed to undertake the work-divine of inſtructing the ignorant, be animated to it—let not their pious zeal be quenched by the frowns of authority, nor the effect of the New Teſtament be anticipated by compelling us to accept it in a mode at which nature revolts."

Here Mr. H. betrays alike an ignorance of the doctrines of the New Teſtament, and a contempt of the ſpirit which it inculcates. If every man have a right to form a creed for himſelf, it neceſſarily follows that God had either no right to form a creed for him, or that he never exerciſed that right. Unfortunately for the poſition of this vain, ignorant, and preſumptuous man, God chuſes to be worſhipped in his own way, and has revealed to his creatures the way in which he will be worſhipped; any deviation from which is an act of diſobedience to him. Is this reverend gentleman to learn that the *labourer is worthy of his hire*; and is he who receives that hire to be branded with the ignominious appellation of *hireling*, and to be repreſented as an impoſtor? In what part of the *New Teſtament* does Mr. H. find a ſanction for ſuch monſtrous doctrine? As to the *Bible* he ſeems to make no account of it, for he talks of the *New Teſtament* excluſively as if the one were at variance with the other, the law with the goſpel. From this circumſtance, and from his earneſt recommendation to turn unlicenſed ſhepherds into the Chriſtian folds, we are led to ſuſpect that our author is ſome itinerant preacher, or poſſibly ſome ſtationary exhorter in the purlieus of Golden Lane. We ſuppoſe the *two unaided individuals* to whoſe ſuperiority over the whole hierarchy, in the taſk of reformation, he gives his decided teſtimony, are Meſſrs. Whitfield and Weſley; and we marvel much that he neglected to complete a hopeful trio, by the addition of Mr. Rowland Hill, their worthy co-adjutor in the pious work of ſchiſm.

In paſſing through a part of La Vendée, the author takes occaſion to vent his democratic ſpleen againſt the French royaliſts, and to

---

" * Arthur O'Leary."

diſplay his inveterate prejudice in favour of the republicans. The former he repreſents as a mercileſs horde of aſſaſſins, dealing deſtruction around them with indiſcriminate fury, not being aware that there are authentic records in exiſtence which belie his aſſertions on this ſubject as on many others. His imputation of perjury (p. 70.) to Louis 16th, is a baſe and cowardly attempt to aſperſe the character of an unhappy prince, whoſe innocence and whoſe virtue are, almoſt univerſally, acknowledged, by the French republicans themſelves. But we cannot wonder at any calumny from a man who reviles our eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, who repreſents our marriage ceremony as "the abſolutely indecent forms of the Church of England," and reprobates it as *ridiculous* and *offenſive*; and who can gravely aſſert, that "France demonſtrated not only a diſpoſition to ſign treaties, but to be *bonâ fide* at peace," while we diſplayed "all the unabating rancorous hoſtility of actual warfare." It were an endleſs taſk indeed to point out all the objectionable paſſages, all the looſe ſentiments, and all the miſchievous principles which are plentifully ſcattered through this motley compoſition.

The laſt pages of the book are evidently written with more care and correctneſs than any other part; indeed the difference is ſo ſtriking, that they ſcarcely appear to be the work of the ſame hand. They relate to the ſtate of agriculture in France, reſpecting which, however, they afford very little information that is new. After drawing a picture of France, the moſt flattering and inviting that can be, though certainly not the moſt *correct* and *true*, in which the exemption from *tythes* and *poor-rates* conſtitute the permanent features; and after uſing every argument that could induce a man to emigrate to that country, he adds one potent diſſuaſive from emigration, which, as it forms almoſt the only paſſage in his book, that can be quoted for the purpoſe of commendation, we ſhall extract.

"What is the inference from all this? that France is the more eligible country in which to fix our abode?—Unqueſtionably not—the country is fine—the climate is delectable and ſalubrious—the people are gentle, affectionate, amiable—plenty abounds—taxation is eaſy—and neither tythes, poor-rates, nor church-rates are exacted; and, to crown the whole, every man ſerves his maker according to the dictates of his own conſcience, without penalty, and without fear—what then do you want more you will ſay? —why, only one little circumſtance more, which gives zeſt to every advantage, and, without which, all that we can poſſeſs is nothing—a circumſtance which Britain proudly boaſts, and which, I truſt, it will boaſt till time ſhall be no more—a circumſtance which has given it commerce, trade, manufactures, and will maintain them in their envied pre-eminence as long as it ſhall laſt. While the ſword peaceably reſts in the ſcabbard, the valetudinarian may ſeek, within the precincts of the republic, the health which the fogs and the intemperance of his native iſle have impaired—the man of ſcience and obſervation may go thither to improve his taſte by ſtudying the remains of accompliſhed antiquity—and, he who courts relaxation, may amuſe himſelf with novelty and variety, and circulate a few of his ſuperfluous guineas;—but, he who is determined at all events, be the conſe-

quence

quence what it may, to canvaſs all the proceedings of the political circles—to cavil at every thing he does not approve or comprehend, and ſound the whoop of tyranny and oppreſſion as often as the exigencies of the ſtate demand ſupplies, had better ſtay at home—France is not the country in which freedom of ſpeech is tolerated; one ſovereign ſpecific cures all curioſity—hushes all grumbling—ſilences every complaint. Law is reduced within a very ſmall compaſs; there is no need there of "Statutes Abridged;" *Sic Volo* of the Grand Conſul has power to ſolve all difficulties—to quiet all the qualms of judge and jury—to conſtitute right or wrong; under a military government, perſon and property are held in a ſort of vaſſalage, and, as often as the one or the other are *(is)* convenient to the haughty tyrant, who ſits exalted upon the ſhoulders of the crouching multitude, the prayers, the tears of the widow and the fatherleſs become inſignificant as the drops of the morning, or the ſighing of the breeze; nay, ſhould thoſe hapleſs unfortunates, preſuming upon the righteouſneſs of their cauſe, dare to become ſulky, or clamorous—though there be no baſtile wherein to encage them till they have learnt not to trouble their ſuperiors with their idle and impertinent wrongs, yet there are other modes of reducing clamour to taciturnity equally effectual at hand. He, therefore, who ſets a value proportioned to its worth upon the ſyſtem of rights which his forefathers nobly wreſted from a tyrant's hand—who defies even power to wrong him till his peers have given it leave—who can neither be taxed nor judged but by his peers—who glories in a conſtitution to which the prince and the peaſant are equally amenable, will never think of bartering privileges like theſe for aught the Continent can give him. What matters it that I can purchaſe lands cheaply as above ſtated—that my huſbandmen toil for ten-pence per day—that proviſions are 50 per cent. lower than in Britain—that taxation is eaſy—church-raſes and tythes gone to their own place—and the poor maintained as they ought to be—if I have no ſecurity from injury—if I dare not exert the privilege which the God of nature gave me—if the breath of a tyrant may annihilate my fortune in a moment—reduce me to beggary, confine me in a dungeon where my complaints cannot be heard, or ſend me acroſs the Atlantic to delve in the bogs and moraſſes of Cayenne?—All, all I poſſeſs beſides is nothing—it is ſecurity, the darling of my ſoul, which renders what I attain worth enjoying:—take from me my ſecurity, and you deprive me of that which *is more valuable* than my life—it is ſecurity which gives the ſpur to my induſtry—it is ſecurity which cheriſhes the adventurous ſpirit of commerce—it is ſecurity which enables me to look forward to old age with cheerfulneſs and hope—and if I muſt reſign my ſecurity I would as ſoon live in awe of the bow-ſtring as of the guillotine. What is it that has introduced ſo many valuable arts and manufactures into Britain?—Security. What is it even now which here gathers together as in one focus, men of ſcience and experiment from every civilized region of the earth?—Security. Why do they fix upon Britain rather than their native countries, for developing their diſcoveries?—Becauſe in Britain only can they reap in ſecurity the reward of their labours: and while ſecurity ſhall be extended as hitherto, to perſon and property—while fortune and life are held not of the capricious will of a deſpot, but of the will of a nation, generous and juſt, though ſometimes the dupe of accompliſhed craft, France will in vain endeavour to enter into competition with it.—It may ſpread abroad all its allurements—it may lay every poſſible reſtraint upon Britiſh merchandize, and endeavour to ſeduce its manufacturers

from

from the comfort and luxury in which they live—but in vain—till it offers them a government a-kin to the Britiſh—till the torpifying influence of deſpotiſm ceaſes to palſy and to affright exertion, it muſt be content to move on as it has done, and hold its ſceptre over a herd of impoveriſhed ſlaves! Britons will turn away from the gilded bait, nor ſacrifice the ſolid realities they poſſeſs to any Utopian viſions with which French philoſophy may endeavour to beguile them."

Mr. H. has ridiculouſly interlarded his narrative with ſcraps of French, evidently for no other purpoſe than that of diſplaying his knowledge of the language; unfortunately for him, however, they only ſerve to place his ignorance in a ſtronger point of view. For the rules of orthography and grammar he betrays as ſovereign a contempt, as for eſtabliſhments and creeds. Ex. Grat.—"*Aubugiſte*" (aubergiſte)—"*Captaine*" (Capitaine)—"*enquietude*" (inquietude)—"*bon bierre*" (bonne)—"*charetes*" (charettes)—"*St. Owen*" (St. Ouen)—"*Liſeux*" (Lisieux)—"*fabrequants*" (fabriquants)—"*chief d'ouvre*" (chef d'œuvre)—"*paulard*" (poulard)—"*roturieu*" (roturier)—"*reſtorateurs*" (reſtaurateurs).—We ſhall cloſe our notice of this contemptible work with two other inſtances of ignorance, of a different deſcription from the above.—P. 143 we are told, that a bill of fare with the prices annexed to each article is "a convenience which London cannot boaſt;" though it is to be found in almoſt every profeſſed eating-houſe in the metropolis. And in p. 159, we learn, for the firſt time, "that, at *Orleans*, the Britiſh name was tarniſhed with indelible diſgrace by the infamous deſtruction of the female enthuſiaſt, Joan of Arc, who, being taken priſoner, was burnt in the Market-place." We really thought that the Maid of Orleans had ſuffered death at *Rouen*, and that her ſtatue was erected in the *Marché aux Veaux* in that city, though as Mr. H. has given ſo minute a deſcription of the capital of Normandy, without noticing the circumſtance, we muſt ſuppoſe that our eyes deceived us, and that all former hiſtorians, Engliſh and French, were miſtaken in their narrative of that memorable fact.

Practical Sermons on ſeveral important Subjects. By the Rev. Theophilus St. John, L.L.B. 8vo. Vernor and Hood. 6s. 6d. boards. 1803.

THE preſs ſeems to be more employed in the printing of ſermons than of any other productions. Some men become authors through neceſſity, ſome through perſuaſion of friends, and many, no doubt, in the hope of thereby benefitting mankind. Thoſe who are influenced by the laſt motive, when they unite judgment with talents, are entitled to, and ſhall receive, our approbation. But ſuch an union is rare: we in vain look for it in the generality of the diſcourſes which come under our inſpection. When a clergyman ſits down to compoſe a ſermon, he ſhould be ſure that his ſubject is in-

ſtructive

ſtructive and intereſting. He ſhould then ſelect ſuch arguments as will be beſt underſtood, and moſt readily applied; and ſhould, in the concluſion of his diſcourſe, impreſs them ſtrongly upon his hearers. Here he muſt be eloquent, if he would be uſeful. Turn to the compoſitions of Demoſthenes and Cicero, and you ſee, in their perorations, the higheſt exertions of genius. Look into the Engliſh ſermons, where you might expect (the ſubjects being of the laſt importance to the hearers) an addreſs to the affections as powerful, and an appeal to the hearers as perſuaſive, as are to be found either in the orations of the Grecian or Roman orators, and what do you diſcover?—The preacher, before he comes to this part of his diſcourſe, is generally exhauſted. He ſets before you, often with perſpicuity and force, his arguments in the illuſtration and ſupport of his ſubject, and then appears to think that his purpoſe is anſwered. But does he not deceive himſelf? The underſtandings of his hearers, if they have attended to his reaſoning, may be convinced; but it is more than probable, that their hearts remain all the while cold and unaffected.

We have been led into theſe reflections by a peruſal of the ſermons before us, in number twenty-ſix. The author modeſtly entreats his readers to conſider them "as ſermons calculated for a popular auditory, ſuch as a clergyman, ardently deſirous of doing good, would write for the uſe of his congregation, without an intention of their being ever read; and which, when they have been preached, are to be depoſited in his ſtudy. Having no motive but utility in their publication, he deprecates the ſeverity and ſolicits the candour of his readers."

"The eloquence of the pulpit," ſays Dr. Blair, in his admirable lecture on this ſubject, "muſt be popular eloquence. One of the firſt qualities of preaching is, in the true ſenſe of the word, to be popular; calculated to make impreſſion on the people, and to ſeize their hearts." The author of theſe valuable ſermons ſeems to have been actuated by this conviction. He has not conſidered *how much* he could ſay on every ſubject on which he expatiates, but only *what* he could ſay *moſt effectually*. In his hiſtorical diſcourſes, he is correct and intereſting; in his moral, practical and perſuaſive; in his doctrinal, where he ſhews himſelf ſincerely attached to the church, orthodox and convincing.

We might inſtance in all theſe caſes from the volume before us; but, for the ſake of brevity, we ſhall content ourſelves with producing a ſpecimen of our author's orthodoxy and argumentative powers, by an extract from the eleventh ſermon; in which he oppoſes his reaſonings to the falſe notions of certain enthuſiaſts on the doctrine of "Regeneration," and plainly ſhews that the words "Kingdom of God," in John iii. 3. do not mean a future ſtate of bliſs, but the ſtate of the Goſpel upon earth.

"The clergy," he ſays, "are very often, and I believe, in general, very unjuſtly, charged with delivering in the pulpit, doctrines different from

from thoſe contained in the Prayer Book. Look, I beſeech you, into the Office of Baptiſm, and convince yourſelves whether our Church, by the new birth, does not mean our admiſſion into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. It is ſaid, ſurely not in a Chriſtian ſpirit, that the clergy, not having received the Holy Ghoſt, cannot judge rightly on the ſubject. So that it ſeems an ignorant machine is enabled, by the miniſtration of the ſpirit, to deliver doctrines diametrically oppoſite to thoſe revealed by our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. But do you think [that] this divine law-giver would have acted with the wiſdom of a human legiſlator, if he had delivered a code of laws, and commanded us to read in order to underſtand them; when at the ſame time he had locked up our underſtandings ſo impenetrably, that they ſhould be no better to us than a ſealed book, unleſs he opened them with his Holy Spirit—a bleſſing not attending either ſevere ſtudy or upright conduct, but given in a manner equally whimſical and extravagant?

"But as we are ſaid 'to be led by the ſpirit, and that the ſpirit of God dwells in our hearts by faith,' it may be thought that ſomething more is meant than merely leading a new life: to which it may be anſwered, that every man who deſires the ſalvation of his ſoul will receive the aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, and will daily qualify his heart more and more for the reception and abiding of God's Holy Spirit: he will pray, and his prayers will be heard and granted, that 'God will put a new ſpirit within him; that he will take the ſtony heart out of his fleſh, to the end that he may walk in God's ſtatutes, and keep his ordinances and do them; that he may be his child, and that God may be his God.' In deſcending into himſelf, if he find his diſpoſition to be perverſe, he immediately ſets himſelf to correct it; if he be obſtinate, peeviſh, ſullen, cenſorious, malicious, paſſionate, covetous, inflexible, he has the aſſurance of the Goſpel, that whilſt he indulges ſuch a temper, he cannot be a child of God, and that God cannot inhabit ſuch a polluted breaſt. He therefore 'brings forth the fruits of the ſpirit, love, joy, peace, long ſuffering, gentleneſs, goodneſs, faith, meekneſs, temperance.' Thus living under the influence of the Goſpel, a new turn is given to the current of his thoughts, new affections are raiſed in his mind, and the paſſions of his heart are determined and regulated in another and a better manner. Call ſuch an one, if you pleaſe, regenerate and born again, I only ſay, you uſe the terms improperly:—the Scriptures ſtyle Barnabas, who was 'full of the Holy Ghoſt, *a good man.*' And indeed there is a ſtrong objection againſt addreſſing individuals or aſſemblies under the titles of believers, ſaints, regenerate, the called; ſuch diſtinctions having a natural tendency to inſpire human nature with rigour, ſingularity, uncharitableneſs, and ſpiritual pride—the very vices [which] we are to renounce before we can derive any benefits from the diſpenſation of the Goſpel; or in the words of the text, before we can 'ſee the kingdom of God.' That you have the Spirit of God give this evidence—go on from one degree of excellence to another, and die daily unto ſin, and live unto righteouſneſs." Pp. 164—167.

But it is by exerting his powers of perſuaſion that this writer claims our particular notice and regard. The concluſion, which uſually conſiſts of a third of the diſcourſe, is vehement and energetic; after which he often adds a ſhort, but pious and impreſſive prayer.

That our readers may judge for themſelves, more eſpecially of the preacher's

preacher's excellence in his *perorations*, we will give an extract from the ſermon "on the devout obſervance of the Lord's day," which is perhaps, on the whole, the moſt uſeful, if not the moſt eloquent, compoſition.

"Let me appeal," ſays he, "to the man who ſometimes attends the ſervice of the church, and aſk him whether there is not more ſatisfaction in publicly confeſſing his ſins, and begging pardon for them—though he may not, and ſuch an one cannot feel a real vital ſpirit of piety—than in remaining at home in indolence, or wandering abroad 'ſeeking reſt and finding none,' or partaking of pleaſure which is attended with painfulneſs in the purſuit, with diſappointment in the poſſeſſion, and with remorſe in the reflection? Let me appeal to the man, who 'keeps not the ſabbath from polluting it,' and aſk him, if the Lord's day be an emblem of heaven, if it be deſigned to prepare him for the celebration of an everlaſting ſabbath, what pleaſure he is to expect in the unceaſing adoration of God, who cannot beſtow a few hours, on the return of every ſeventh day, upon his Maker and Redeemer? Or if he hath ſo much the appearance of religion as to attend public worſhip, yet cannot devote any part of the remainder of the day to ſerious meditation, private prayer, and the acquiſition of that knowledge which will make him wiſe unto ſalvation, but ſpends it either liſtleſs and indolent, or in the fatigues of buſineſs, or the amuſements of company? Could it be ſuppoſed that ſuch a man had received an expreſs command from God to 'eſteem the ſabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable, and to honour it by refraining to do his own ways, to find his own pleaſure, or to ſpeak his own words?' Could it be ſuppoſed that ſuch an one put in a claim to the happineſs of ſerving God for ever and ever? How natural it ſeems, that, on the return of every ſeventh day, the poor ſhould aſſemble at the houſe of God to beg his bleſſing and protection, to deplore their offences and tranſgreſſions, and to return thanks for the health, and ſtrength, and employment afforded them, by which they are enabled to ſupport themſelves and their families! that the remaining part of the day ſhould be employed in reflecting on their condition, and preparing for that ſtate where virtue will be triumphant, and piety ennobled; for that ſtate, where all diſtinctions, but thoſe of religion, ceaſe for ever! How natural that the rich ſhould teſtify their ſenſe of God's goodneſs, by aſſembling with thoſe to whom Providence hath denied ſo large a ſhare of worldly comforts, and that they ſhould not ſuffer their attendance on public worſhip to be interrupted, as we too frequently ſee, by an excurſion of pleaſure, an engagement of buſineſs, or a viſit of ceremony! Their example to ſociety, and gratitude to God demand of them a very different obſervance of the Lord's day. He who inſtituted it for his honour and our benefit, he it is to whom they are indebted for the means of pleaſure, the avocations of buſineſs, the diſtinctions of ceremony—and ought engagements, ſuch as theſe, to take place of his honour, and to ſuperſede his worſhip? 'Do ye thus requite the Lord?' How natural, that the opportunities of happineſs which are ſo kindly put into your hands ſhould be improved to your eternal ſalvation!

"Let us all be perſuaded, my brethren, henceforth to 'hallow the ſabbath,' to ceaſe on that day from 'doing our own ways, ſeeking our own pleaſure, or ſpeaking our own words,' but let us delight ourſelves in the worſhip and ſervice of God; let us, on that day, particularly, 'call our ways

ways to remembrance,' examining with ſtrict impartiality, and ſevere attention, whether the day which was intended to promote, above all others, our future welfare, hath not often been converted to the purpoſes of torpid indolence, or licentious pleaſure. Let the many fatal examples of thoſe, whoſe career in wickedne s was commenced by profaning the ſabbath, and terminated by an untimely death, warn every father and every maſter of a family, leſt the unhappy end of his children, or of any part of his houſehold, ſhould rack him with the reflection, that, either ſeduced by his example, or encouraged by his connivance to profane the Lord's day, the guilt they incur, the puniſhment they may ſuffer, ſhould be owing to himſelf. And let us often anticipate the awful hour when we ſhall lie on the bed of death, an inhabitant, [inhabitants] as it were, of both worlds; whether we ſhall be diſtracted with terror, warning, beſeeching, conjuring our aſſembled family, [families] not to ſpend the ſabbath in the manner we have ſpent it; or whether, looking upon death without affright and amazement, we can exhort them, as we have done, to 'do likewiſe;' expreſſing humble hopes, that, after having paſſed our ſabbaths in the congregations of men on earth, we ſhall ſoon be admitted, through the merits and ſatisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, to celebrate an eternal ſabbath with ſaints and angels in heaven." P. 59, &c.

We are unwilling to cloſe this article without another excerpt, which ſhall be from the ſermon "on the loſs of the Soul."

"Let us bring the awful ſubject ſtill nearer; let us ſuppoſe that we who are here aſſembled are the only people upon earth; that this temple is the ſeat of judgment; that this day, I tremble whilſt I make the ſuppoſition! is the great day, 'in which God will judge the world in righteouſneſs;' that this is the laſt hour of our lives, and the conſummation of all things; that the heavens are opening over our heads, and that Jeſus Chriſt is appearing in all his majeſty with angels and archangels; that the laſt trumpet is now giving the alarming ſummons; and that we are attending to receive either the ſentence of approbation, or the doom of judgment: on what ſide ſhould we each of us be placed? on the right hand, or on the leſt? amongſt the ſheep, or the goats? How many of us would be called to join the choir of heaven? How many condemned to weeping and wailing in hell? How many would cry, 'Come, Lord Jeſus, come quickly?' How many more, I fear, would 'call on the mountains to fall on them, and the hills to cover them?' Repreſent frequently to yourſelves this awful, this intereſting ſcene, and you will feel the force of our Saviour's queſtion—'What is a man profited if he ſhall gain the whole world and loſe his own ſoul? or what ſhall a man give in exchange for his ſoul?'

"Lord of heaven and earth, impreſs on our imaginations the awful ſcene, at which we are not to be unconcerned ſpectators. Grant, we beſeech thee, gracious God, when the vivifying call of the laſt moſt awful ſolemnity ſhall awaken us from the ſleep of death; when the trumpet of the archangel ſhall ſummon the quick and dead of every nation, and age, and tongue, to give account of themſelves to God; when we ſhall be caught up in the air, and placed before the throne, that tremendous throne from which our final ſentence will be pronounced, [that] the voice of mercy, the gracious voice which in agonies unutterable prayed for the authors of them, may acquit, approve, reward us with the bliſs, for which

at

at thy right hand he is now interceding, that where he is there we may be also!" Pp. 133, &c.

We strongly recommend this volume, as well adapted to produce benefit in the family, and afford entertainment in the closet, by the taste which is displayed in it, and the eloquence which it contains. It consists not, as the author very properly remarks, of flimsy declamation; though he sometimes, we think, is rather too *fond of verbiage:* but the piety and the zeal, which appear throughout, compensate for those little defects, which the sternness of criticism might occasionally discover, and be tempted to expose.

The History of the Maroons, from their Origin to the Establishment of their Chief Tribe at Sierra Leone: including the Expedition to Cuba, for the purpose of procuring Spanish Chasseurs; and the State of the Island of Jamaica for the last ten Years: with a Succinct History of the Island previous to that Period. By R. C. Dallas, Esq. 2 vol. 8vo. 1l. 1s. Longman and Rees. 1803.

HAVING been allured by this attractive title-page to an early perusal of Mr. Dallas's work, we think it incumbent upon us not to delay our review of it, as the subjects are very interesting to the public, and as whatever relates to the West Indies at this important era of colonial history demands immediate attention. The effects of the revolutionary convulsions of Europe now continuing in horrid agitation in the island of St. Domingo, and the improved facilities of intercourse with the regions beyond the Western Ocean, in a manner approximate the extremes of the globe, and the mind is more engaged with the concerns and transactions of Trans-Atlantic islands, than formerly it used to be with the events of a distant country.

The opposition of a handful of men, inhabiting the interior of Jamaica, to a British force almost ten times their number, is, perhaps, one of the most extraordinary passages in the military history of Great Britain; and the removal of the whole tribe, men, women, and children, from their country, a transportation unparalleled in the annals of any nation. Till the year 1795 the name of Maroon had been little heard of. After the conquest of Jamaica in 1655, by Penn and Venables, bodies of the Spanish Negroes fled to the mountains: other fugitives followed the example, and in the course of time established themselves, by treaties with the government, in different parts of the island. Their freedom was acknowledged, and their connexion with the white inhabitants regulated by laws expressly enacted. These occurrences took place nearly a century ago; the Maroons hunted the wild boar, made no progress in civilization, and were forgotten even in the island they inhabited, except as they occasionally brought home runaway negroes, or assisted in quelling rebellions among the slaves. In the year 1795 the alarming war, which

the

the tribe of Trelawney Maroons waged againſt the government in Jamaica, awakened the attention of this country, and of the parliament. The juſtice of the war, and the nature of the warfare, became the ſubjects of converſation, and of parliamentary enquiry. It created a lively intereſt, but the more important events of that period riſing daily, cloſe upon our ſhores, engaged the public mind; the fate of Europe abſorbed the diſtant and petty concerns of the Trelawney mountains; the paſſions were all employed on the eaſt, and on the ſouth, and curioſity itſelf was ſated with the magnitude of its Gallic aliments. An obſervation that brings to our mind the opening of Mr. Dallas's preface, which ſo elegantly compreſſes into two pages ſome of the grandeſt features of the French revolution, that we cannot refrain from preſenting it to our readers as a beautiful paſſage.

"The magnitude of the objects which have engaged the attention of the world during the laſt thirteen years; the revolution of empires, the deſtruction of ſtates, the extinction of whole claſſes of men, the alteration of eſtabliſhed cuſtoms, the ſacrifice of millions of lives, the general convulſions throughout the earth, the terrific though unavailing ambition of groveling upſtarts, the unnatural policy and feeble efforts of the moſt powerful governments, the wonderful exploits of Britiſh arms in every quarter of the globe; the return of France to abſolute authority, and the extraordinary feats and good fortune of the man who, big with the intent of Cæſar croſſing the Rubicon at the head of the flower of the Roman armies, croſſed the Mediterranean without a ſoldier, and ſeized upon the empire; have accuſtomed the minds of men to gigantic contemplations. We have ſeen a pious and beneficent monarch periſh on a ſcaffold; another, virtuous, ardent, and heroic, publicly aſſaſſinated; a third, privately put to death; a fourth and fifth, chaſed from their capitals; and a ſovereign pontiff torn from St. Peter's chair, hurried into foreign lands, and dying in captivity; a Queen, bereſt of her crown, thruſt in tatters into a common jail amongſt the vileſt of criminals, kept awhile alive on the ſorrieſt food, and at laſt, with an heroic firmneſs becoming a Queen, yielding her life to the public inſtrument of execution. We have ſeen a chain of oppoſed armies extending from the north to the ſouth of Europe; the navy of a ſmall iſland blockading all the ports of all the maritime powers; a Ruſſian iſſuing from his frozen region, chaſing victorious armies before him through Italy, and ſcowering the Alps; and an Engliſhman blowing up navies, one after the other, beneath the line and at the pole; in fine, we have ſeen all the paſſions in a tempeſt, and nature herſelf ſtruggling againſt the chaos which threatened her very exiſtence. But the contemplation of ſtupendous objects, far from diſqualifying the mind for the reliſh of leſs extenſive views, heightens its ſatisfaction in them, as the eye, after poring over the unbounded expanſe of the ocean, is relieved and delighted by a ſtreamlet and a dell."

It was not indeed wholly owing to the gigantic contemplations here ſketched, that the ſubject of the Maroon war was ſo ſuddenly and ſo readily dropped, but attention thus occupied was eaſily withdrawn from it. A haſty narrative was publiſhed at the time by Mr. Edwards,

Edwards, and the public might think that the whole had been before them; and were it not for the preſent work, this ſingular portion of hiſtory ſeemed doomed to oblivion. We congratulate our readers that it has been ſnatched from that fate by a pen able to give it its due intereſt, and which its guide in this inſtance, as well as on former occaſions, has employed in the cauſe of truth, virtue, and religion.

We find by the Preface, that the authorities for the facts and tranſactions, related by the author, are of the moſt indubitable kind, taken not only from the teſtimony of men who were perſonally engaged in them, but from the laws and legiſlative records of the country. Although the hiſtory of the Maroons is the chief ſubject, the ſcope of the work embraces all the topics relative to the iſland of Jamaica, and we ſhall give a ſhort analyſis of it before we proceed to obſervations on particular parts.

The origin, wars, and tranſportation of the Maroons occupy the greater part of the volumes; but to uſe the author's words; "the ſituation of Jamaica, at the breaking-out of the French revolution, its agriculture, commerce, population, force, and the ſtate of ſlavery at that period; a hiſtory of the Maroons from their origin to the expulſion of the greateſt part of them, their baniſhment to Nova Scotia, and ſubſequent removal to the coaſt of Africa; the ſituation of Jamaica at the concluſion of the war between Great Britain and France, and the conſideration of a plan for the future protection, ſecurity, and proſperity of the iſland," are the ſubjects treated in the work.—It is divided into letters, the author having rather prudiſhly obſerved in his preface, that "though his taſk was of an hiſtorical nature, he was ready to perſuade himſelf it was one that did not require all the dignity of hiſtory, and glad to take ſhelter under the eaſe and familiarity of epiſtolary writing." There are twenty-one letters: the firſt is introductory, and gives an account of the proſperity, agriculture, trade, population, and military force of Jamaica, and the ſtate of ſlavery in that iſland, at the commencement of the French revolution, with the relative affairs of St. Domingo. The ſecond and third recite the origin of the Maroons, their firſt wars, and the treaties entered into with them. The fourth letter contains the account of their towns, character, cuſtoms, manners, population, and the laws relative to them. The fifth, ſixth, ſeventh, and eighth letters give a circumſtantial hiſtory of the cauſes and progreſſive events of their laſt war, to the middle of December, 1795; and here the firſt volume concludes. The three firſt letters of the ſecond volume, being the 9th, 10th, and 11th of the ſeries, are devoted to the Cuba expedition, and in which the author relates the occurrences of a voyage to that iſland, undertaken to procure Spaniſh chaſſeurs and their dogs, and gives a deſcription of theſe. In letter 12th the narrative of the Maroon war is reſumed, and the events detailed to the termination of it, by a treaty entered into by General Walpole with the Maroons. The 13th letter relates the different opinions reſpecting

General Walpole's treaty, the proceedings of the Houſe of Aſſembly, on the concluſion of the war, and the departure of the Spaniſh chaſſeurs. The 14th, 15th, and 16th letters treat of the tranſportation of the Maroons, and concurrent ſubjects; their ſituation and conduct in Nova Scotia; the meaſures of the Aſſembly of Jamaica, and of the Britiſh government reſpecting them; their removal to Sierra Leone, and their preſent character. The remaining letters contain the account of Jamaica for the laſt ten years. The ſeries of political events is continued in the 17th. The 18th details improvements in agriculture and ſugar-making, and contains a propoſal for improving the navigation of the Gulf of Mexico. In the 19th we have an account of the modes of agency, and the conduct of agents. The 20th ſtates the opinions reſpecting the ſlave-trade, and the topics relating to it; the preſent ſtate of ſlavery in Jamaica; the defects of the colonial ſyſtem; and the ſubject of religion. In the laſt letter the ſubject of religion is continued, and plans for the further ſecurity of the iſland ſuggeſted.

Arrangement and perſpicuity are the leading properties of Mr. D.'s narration. The origin of the Maroons is traced with great preciſion, and a conſiderable degree of intereſt raiſed by the account of their firſt wars, but theſe are comparatively abſorbed when we are led on to conſider their late aſtoniſhing ſtruggle. Neglected by the government, guided by no efforts of the white inhabitants to the paths of civilization, and continuing to paſs their lives in a wild ſtate of exiſtence, it is not extraordinary that they ſhould not be able to reaſon with logical preciſion, or that their underſtanding ſhould be guided by their wiſhes. They had formed a very warm attachment for the ſuperintendant placed over them. He and his father had been time out of mind their rulers and friends, and they in a manner conceived the ſuperintendency fixed in the family, for his ſon alſo was looked up to by them. For ſome years the improvement of his private fortune had engroſſed the attention of this beloved ſuperintendant, and he was ſeldom with them. The conſequence of this was, fruitleſs complaints and inſubordination, and the government removed him and his ſon from their offices, appointing another ſuperintendant for Trelawney Maroon Town. This was not what the Maroons wanted; they wiſhed the reinſtatement of the man they loved, and being diſappointed in their deſire, broke out into exceſſes which at length proceeded to acts of rebellion: they firſt inſulted the new ſuperintendant, and at laſt turned him out of their town, threatening his life if he returned.

This was the origin of the war; and we are not a little ſurpriſed that it ſhould have been withheld from the public at the time, when they were inclined to reprobate the war as unjuſt on the ſide of the government. In contemplating this cauſe it is evident that the conduct of the Maroons cannot be juſtified; for we agree with our author, that "the government might have inclined to gratify their prejudices

judices without being able to accompliſh their wiſh; it could not be expected that any man would, for life, devote himſelf excluſively to an office that interfered with the important intereſts of his family: it was therefore an unwarrantable hope, ſpringing from unregulated paſſions." Inſtead of juſtifying the proceedings of the Colonial government on this unanſwerable ground, an incident was laid hold of for its defence which was untenable, and which ſeems the only foundation on which the Maroons could ſupport a ſhadow of juſtification; and that was the whipping of two of their people in a workhouſe by the hand of a negro employed to whip the ſlaves ſent thither. This was ſtated to be the cauſe of the war, and the puniſhment of the Maroons was defended. The Maroons certainly made uſe of the circumſtance, but it ſhould have been ſhown to be, as it really was, a mere pretext to cover the injuſtice of their diſcontent, and diſorderly conduct. In the ſtatement of the turbulence of the Maroons to obtain an object on which they had unreaſonably ſet their mind, Mr. D. completely juſtifies the government in the determination of ſuppreſſing a ſpirit that might lead to the moſt fatal conſequences; but far from juſtifying the ſubſequent meaſures that were taken in the progreſs of this melancholy ſtruggle, the facts he ſtates give room to lament the ſingular fate of this unfortunate tribe. There is not a doubt that they had been of great ſervice to the country, and were highly valued by many of the planters, who were anxious to bring the affair to an amicable iſſue. The force drawn out againſt them, the advice of ſome temperate chiefs among them, and the arguments of their old ſuperintendant, who had gone up to their town, had brought them to reflexion, and from the moſt violent ecſtacies of wrath and determined vengeance, they fell into the contrary extreme of timidity and humiliation. They appointed ſix of their chief men to go up to the capital, to make in their perſons ſubmiſſion for the whole body; and nothing was heard of but reconciliation and peace. From this period the error appears evidently on the other ſide.—While the Maroon captains were on their way to town, the public mind was thrown into new agitation by the affairs of St. Domingo; a variety of reports reſpecting French plots was circulated; and among others ſome relating to the Maroons. In order to detain the troops, which were ready to be embarked for St. Domingo, a council of war was held, and martial law proclaimed. The detaining of the troops may be allowed to be prudent, but the meaſures that immediately followed cannot be ſaid to have been dictated by wiſdom. The ſix Maroon chiefs, with their paſſport in their hands, were ſeized on the road and thrown into irons; a proclamation was iſſued, offering a reward for the head of every Trelawney Maroon after the 12th of Auguſt, and thirty-ſeven of them, having ſurrendered previous to that day for the purpoſe of conciliation, were bound, their arms behind their backs, and ſent into confinement at Montego Bay. This conduct was drawing the ſword, and throwing away the ſcabbard; an

unaccountable precipitation, and by no means warranted by the documents that were adduced as proofs of a conſpiracy between the Maroons and the French. Theſe documents are inſerted in an append x at the end of the firſt volume; and it is a very ſtriking circumſtance that they were not in exiſtence for ſome weeks after the declaring of martial law, and the execution of the above meaſures; and when examined, they prove at laſt to be "depoſitions, taken *ſubſequently*, of converſations and vague notions of different times *prior* to the departure of the ſix captains from Trelawney Town, or of expreſſions uſed, and acts committed *after* they were thrown into irons." Another event, which took place at the ſame time, concurred to rouſe the ſpirit of revenge among the Maroons, and to confirm the reſolution of reſiſting, rather than ſhare the fate to which ſuch of their people as had tried conciliatory plans had been doomed. Two men, who afterwards proved their boldeſt and ableſt leaders, and who had eſtabliſhed their families near ſome of the planters, in Weſtmoreland, had gone up to Trelawney Town to adviſe the Maroons, and it was by their advice that the thirty-ſeven ſurrendered in hopes of obtaining terms. While they were thus employed, their houſes were burnt, and their proviſion grounds laid waſte by a party of the Weſtmoreland Militia, who unfortunately ſuſpected that they were gone to join the other Maroons in a war againſt the white inhabitants. The door of reconciliation was thus ſhut, and a vengeful war begun, which for ſome months kept the iſland of Jamaica in conſtant danger of total deſtruction. The fact ſeems to be, that the Maroons were held in contempt as an enemy, and no doubt entertained of their being terrified into an unconditional ſurrender. A knowledge of their former wars would have prevented this miſtake. Mr. D., on the beſt authorities, has given a circumſtantial and intereſting detail of the ſucceſſive actions and events of the war. It would lead us into too great a length were we to follow him in theſe, and it is probable that the curioſity of moſt of our readers will induce them to peruſe them in the work itſelf, as it cannot but excite a general intereſt: we ſhall, however, ſelect the account of Colonel Fitch's death.

"About a mile and a quarter to the ſouthward of Colonel Fitch's poſition, there was an advanced poſt, conſiſting of ſome huts, ſurrounded by ſlight palliſadoes, occupied by thirty privates, two corporals, and a ſerjeant, under Captain Lee of the 83d, who, finding his ſituation by no means a ſafe one, as it was commanded by heights acceſſible to the Maroons, informed the commanding officer of the danger of it. Paying immediate attention to this information, Colonel Fitch, on the 12th of September, about nine o'clock, ſet out for Captain Lee's poſt, attended by Colonel Jackſon of the militia, Lieut. Brunt the adjutant of the 83d, Capt. Briſſet, Mr. Vaughan, and ſeveral other perſons, among whom were two Accompong Maroon captains, whoſe names were Reid and Badnage. It is to be obſerved that at this time the Accompongs had offered to ſerve againſt the Trelawney Maroons, and Colonel Walpole, who commanded

in

in their diſtrict, had ſent ſome of them to the ſeat of action. Previous to his departure from the Old Town, Colonel Fitch ſet his watch with Lieut. Dixon's of the Artillery, who a few days before had arrived at Head Quarters, with a detachment, two field-pieces, and a howitzer, deſiring him to fire one of the field-pieces preciſely at twelve o'clock. This was to aſcertain the exact bearing of Lee's poſt, for which purpoſe a compaſs alſo was uſed; and I mention it to give ſome idea of a country, where, in ſo ſhort a diſtance, the windings and intricacies of a track are ſuch as to defy all certainty of its courſe or termination.

" Colonel Fitch, on his arrival at the poſt, being ſatisfied with the repreſentation that had been made of it by Captain Lee, requeſted Mr. Vaughan to return to Head Quarters and deſire the firing of the field piece to be delayed exactly half an hour longer than the hour firſt fixed. In the mean time adding to thoſe who had accompanied him Captain Lee and ſixteen of his men, he moved forward with the double intention of advancing the poſt, and of eſtabliſhing it in a poſition leſs liable to be annoyed. As this party proceeded, the mountains ſeemed to riſe higher and higher, and the valleys to ſink; a better ſituation was ſought in vain, none preſented itſelf. Marching on, however, they came to a ſpot, where the Accompong captains, obſerving ſome recent traces of the Maroons, ſaid it was better to advance no farther, as the rebels had juſt been there, and could not be far off. Being ridiculed for their timidity, they proved that they had good grounds for the advice they had given, by pointing out the tops of the wild coco or eddo that they had lately dug up, and other inconteſtible evidences.

" Proofs ſo unanſwerable made an impreſſion on Colonel Jackſon, who immediately repreſented to Col. Fitch, that his life was too valuable to be unneceſſarily riſked, requeſting permiſſion to advance with Capt. Briſſet a little farther to reconnoitre the ground, and declaring, that if the nature of it proved impracticable and unpromiſing, he would return, but if at all favourable, he would diſpatch immediate information to him of it. The earneſtneſs with which Jackſon ſpoke made Col. Fitch ſmile.—' What, Jackſon,' ſaid he, ' in a point of duty do you think I ſhould not be as forward as any other man?' Then in a placid manner, which was natural to him, he added: ' Well; go with Briſſet; there is no keeping him back; but I ſhall expect to ſee you here again in ten minutes; for if no eligible poſition preſents itſelf within a quarter of a mile, I muſt endeavour to ſecure Lee a little better.'

" Col. Jackſon propoſed to Capt. Briſſet, that they ſhould go alone, but the latter deſired the two Accompong Captains, Reid and Badnage, to advance with them. They moved on accordingly, Col. Fitch and the party following ſlowly. When they had proceeded about a hundred yards, the path ſtriking into two ſmaller ones of very abrupt deſcent, Jackſon propoſed taking the one, and Briſſet preferred the other. After a moment's heſitation, Briſſet, turning to the two Accompongs, ſaid haſtily,—' Come, take that way, and I will follow you.' Theſe three had gone down about five yards, and Jackſon, who had puſhed in to examine the nature of the path he propoſed, had returned and was juſt deſcending after the others, when a tremendous volley of ſmall arms, which made the towering mountains, or rather immeaſurable precipices that encloſed the ſcene of action, reſound with thundering reverberations, was poured upon the whole party by the Maroons, from an elevation within ten paces of them. The ſoldiers me-

chanically discharged their pieces at the smoke made by the volley, but to little purpose; for, as usual, the unseen enemy were covered and protected by trees and rocks. On the fire of the Maroons, Brillet, wounded, was seen staggering to the right, and probably fell dead among the bushes. Reid, the Accompong, gave a loud shriek and fell; Badnage, the other Accompong, fell dead without a struggle or a groan. Jackson escaped unhurt, and running back on ground lower than the path, came up to Col. Fitch, whom he found seated on an old fallen tree, his arm supported by a projecting stump, and his head resting on his hand. His blood was trickling down from the middle of his waistcoat, and the short red and brown striped linen jacket which he wore, stuck out behind, appearing as if a rib had been broken. There could be no doubt that he was mortally wounded. Jackson, taking him by the hand that hung motionless by his side, repeated his name to him. 'It is Jackson, your friend Jackson, look at me.' Saying this, he drew from his side a small dagger, and holding it up to Col. Fitch, assured him that he should not fall alive into the hands of the rebels while he could prevent it, declaring at the same time that he would die with him rather than leave him. No one who knew Jackson could doubt that he would have executed this brave resolution, had the occasion required it. Fitch knew him capable of it, and turned his face with a benign look towards him as if to say something kind; but by this time the Maroons had reloaded, and the clicking of their guns as they were cocked one after the other, giving notice of their being ready to fire, Col. Jackson called out to the soldiers to lie down, which being obeyed in proper time, the second volley did little mischief. On hearing the order, Colonel Fitch turned his head towards the men, appearing to wish to speak, while Jackson at the same instant was endeavouring to pull him down under cover. This he resisted and again turned, seemingly to speak to Capt. Lee or the men; but remaining in the situation I have described, he was too conspicuous a mark, and Jackson's efforts to remove him from it were succeeding when they were too well aided by a fatal ball, which penetrated Colonel Fitch's forehead just above the right eye, and he fell lifeless.

"Several of the party being killed, and many wounded, among whom were Captain Lee and Adjutant Brunt, the former mortally, Col. Jackson thought it best to retreat as speedily as possible; and with the remainder of the party effected his escape, returning, after meeting the men left at Lee's post, who had advanced on hearing the firing, to Col. Fitch's post, where one of the wounded soldiers died that night, and another the next morning: Capt. Lee survived a few days longer. The loss on this occasion was eight killed and seven wounded. No man was ever more lamented than the gallant and amiable Col. Fitch. In his person he was tall and graceful. The manly beauty of his face expressing the liberality of his mind, rendered his countenance extremely interesting and engaging. Easy and affable in his manners, he was never happier than when relieving the wants of his soldiers, or providing some comfort for the younger officers from his own stores. It was his custom to lay in a stock of things for his men, which he occasionally dealt out in presents or rewards. His social disposition enlivened the tropic summits that were the seat of the Maroon campaign: his table was crowded by his friends, and, by method in his establishment, he threw around his hut a certain elegance that bespoke the gentleman. His activity in the field equalled his modesty in

company

company. He fell in the bloom of youth. He was brave, benevolent, and of a bewitching addreſs. He had talents, and energy to make them uſeful; he was therefore a great loſs to his country: and his private virtues endeared him to his friends, to whom his death was a deep wound."

General Walpole ſucceeded Col. Fitch in the command of the troops, on the 15th of September. His acknowledged talents availed him little at firſt, in a ſcene of action ſo uncommon, and in a warfare ſo novel; but by degrees he turned their own mode of fighting againſt the Maroons, and in the end of October he drove them from the Glen or Cockpit, at their famous defile, called Guthri 's.

" The rainy ſeaſon now abated, and Gen. Walpole began his offenſive operations. Having gained an accurate knowledge of the country, he determined, in the firſt place, to cut off the Maroons from all points of convenient rendezvous; and he particularly conſidered, that if he could deprive them of the reſource of water, he ſhould ſecure an advantage that muſt tend to a termination of the war. This, therefore, was one of his chief objects; and from the ſcarcity of that neceſſary of life in the ſurrounding mountains in dry weather, he had great hope of accompliſhing it. The poſition now held by the rebels ſupplied water in abundance, there being a ſpring called Petit River Bottom in the cockpit to which Guthrie's Defile led, and where they were encamped on a ſmall flat of ſeven acres. From ſuch a poſition it was abſolutely neceſſary to diſlodge them, and the General ſoon convinced them that it was not, as they had flattered themſelves, impoſſible. The hill above his quarters being now cleared, he ordered a howitzer to be mounted upon it, and ſhells to be thrown into the cockpit, from which they were ſoon driven, leaving it to their conqueror; who, upon their evacuating it, entered with his troops by the formidable defile. 'Damn dat little Buckra,' ſaid the Maroons on retiring, 'he cunning more dan dem toder. Dis here da new faſhion for fight; him fire him big ball a'ter you, and when big ball 'top, de damn ſunting fire a'ter you again. Come, boys, make we go take farer, and ſee wha he will do den.'—'Damn that little white man, he is more cunning than the others. This is a new mode of fighting: he fires a big ball among us, and when that ſeems to ſtop, the damned thing of itſelf fires again upon us. Come, my boys, let us be off, and ſee when we are at a diſtance what he will do."

But what were the ſucceſſes of this nature gained by Gen. Walpole, when an endleſs range of cockpits lay behind the enemy, who, on finding themſelves moleſted in one, might decamp to another by rugged paſſages, where they could not be followed by the troops? The following is an account of Johnſon, the Maroon chief, one of thoſe whoſe ſettlements in Weſtmoreland had been deſtroyed.

" The body of the Maroons againſt which theſe operations were carried on, conſiſted of their greateſt force, and were ſtill called old Montague's, though commanded by Capt. Charles Schaw; but the chief commander among them was Johnſon, who was generally at the head of a force inferior in number to thoſe with Schaw, but more active and enterpriſing.—Theſe were the men by whom the greateſt ravages had been committed: theſe, led by Johnſon, had burned the ſettlements in Weſtmoreland, and

afterwards Mocha, Catadupa, Lapland, Ginger Hill, Gowdeys, and other places. Johnſon ſurpriſed a convoy of proviſions guarded by ten ſoldiers, going to the poſts eſtabliſhed at Mocha and Auguſtus, and cut off the heads of the ſoldiers. He had no particular ſtation, but ſhifted from ground to ground, according to the enterpriſe he meditated. Though known to be at a certain place one day, he would the next ſurpriſe another place at the diſtance of twenty miles. He was not encumbered with women or children, and to his own party he had attached about forty ſlaves, whom he had armed. Theſe had cauſe to repent it; but having once joined they could not retract, and ſuffered themſelves to be perſuaded that when a peace took place, they would be included in the terms as Maroons. Some of them Johnſon flogged for not fighting, while he made others captains, whom he again broke or flogged if they deſerved it. This treatment was general; nor did he ſcruple to inflict the ſame puniſhment on his own ſons; and, Smith excepted, whoſe vigour and valour were equal to his own, he was a deſpot over his men; yet under his diſcipline they fought better than the reſt. On his ſurrender, he declared that he had never been ſurpriſed, but when the ſlaves were his out-ſentries; and that though ſeveral of theſe had been killed, he never loſt but two Maroons. He was, however, ſurpriſed on the 8th of November, by a very ſelect party from Weſtmoreland, conſiſting chiefly of people of colour under Mr. Williams and Ruſſell, and nothing but his uncommon valour ſaved him. Far from ſcreening himſelf during the engagement, he was loud in giving his orders, and was violent in the abuſe of Williams, whom he knew. Being wounded with a ball, he immediately cut it out with his knife, and continued exerting himſelf to the utmoſt to obtain the victory; but all his efforts proved fruitleſs, and after a hard ſtruggle, he was obliged to quit the field, which he managed to do with great addreſs."

Weary of the ſtruggle and fearful of the event, the planters became anxious for the termination of the war, and a council was held in which it was propoſed to ſend into the woods ſome of the Maroon chiefs, who had been confined in irons, *to perſuade the rebels to make peace.* This humiliating meaſure was ſtrenuouſly oppoſed by Gen. Walpole, and he urged the diſadvantages of it ſo forcibly, that it was unanimouſly relinquiſhed.

With this period of the war the firſt volume cloſes, and our limits compel us to poſtpone our review of the remainder of the work, which, however, we ſhall not delay pronouncing to be very intereſting and important in its nature, and maſterly in its execution.

This volume contains a ſuccinct hiſtory of the Iſland of Jamaica, previous to the time at which the work commences. It is compoſed with judgment and in pleaſing language, preſenting all that may be thought intereſting to readers whoſe connexion with that iſland is not ſuch as to have led them through the voluminous hiſtories of it. At the end of the volume is an Appendix, which furniſhes the reader with the Conſolidated Act, or *Code Noir* of Jamaica, and ſome of the proceedings of the Houſe of Aſſembly cited in the work. Two maps are given to illuſtrate the ſubject; the one, a general outline of the iſland of Jamaica; the other, the ſeat of the late Maroon war, on a

larger

larger ſcale, given, as we are informed in the preface, to the author by Mr. Robertſon, who, under the patronage of the Aſſembly, has taken a minute ſurvey of the iſland, and is about to publiſh four maps of it on a very extenſive ſcale. Each volume is embelliſhed with an appropriate engraving as a frontiſpiece: in the firſt is Old Cudjoe making peace, and in the ſecond a Spaniſh Chaſſeur of the Iſland of Cuba, with his dogs. Nothing ſeems to have been neglected that could render the work in every way acceptable to the public.

(To be continued.)

The Infidel Father; by the Author of "A Tale of the Times," "A Goſſip's Story," &c. 3 vols. 12mo. Pp. 998 Longman and Rees. 1802.

WE have had frequent occaſion to lament that the ſpecies of literary compoſition, unhappily moſt in vogue in the preſent degenerate times, and which has, therefore, been rendered by the ſceptical, ſchiſmatical, and diſaffected writers of the age, a vehicle for the promulgation of every falſe, bad, and vicious principle, that can corrupt the heart or contaminate the mind of the preſent and of the riſing generation, has not ſufficiently occupied the attention of authors who are both willing and able to counteract the pernicious effects of the mental poiſon thus copiouſly adminiſtered. Publications of a religious and moral tendency, unleſs extenſively read, by thoſe who ſtand moſt in need of the inſtruction which they contain, are productive of little advantage; and in order to be ſo read, they muſt, occaſionally, be moulded into that popular form, which moſt attracts the public attention. If the ſhelves of circulating libraries, which ſupply a very large proportion of the younger part, at leaſt, of the population of the country, with maxims, ideas, and principles; with topics of converſation, and even with rules of action, are loaded with pernicious books, which poiſon, while they amuſe, the mind, and pervert, while they profeſs to inform, the underſtanding, ſurely no ſmall portion of blame muſt attach to thoſe who, aware of the evil, and poſſeſſed of the means of correction, ſtill neglect to apply the only efficacious remedy. Mrs. Weſt, the author of this novel, is not to be claſſed among theſe ſilent and paſſive friends of religious and ſocial order; vigilant in obſervation, and active in exertion, ſhe openly braves their enemies; boldly throws down the gauntlet to the philoſophiſtical ſages, the Paines, the Godwins, the Woolſtonecrofts, the Williamſes, of the age; hurls defiance in the face of faſhionable vice, and holds up her unbluſhing votaries to obloquy and ſhame. Standing firm herſelf on the rock of religion, ſhe warns others that it is the only tenable ground which a Chriſtian can occupy, and proves to the ſceptic and the infidel, that the ſandy baſis, on which they have fooliſhly erected *their* gaudy ſuperſtructure, is unable to

reſiſt

reſiſt the ſlighteſt breath of reaſon and of faith, but muſt fall before it, and involve its raſh and fooliſh tenants in irretrievable ruin.

"The particular deſign of the preſent work"—ſhe tells us—"is to ſhew the ſuperiority which religious principle poſſeſſes, when compared with a ſenſe of honour, moral fitneſs, or a love of general applauſe. The ſtory is confeſſedly ſubordinate to this aim; and thoſe who diſlike it will obſerve, that the *argumentative* part is not affected by the faults of the *narrative*.—The epiſodical characters have a uſe beſides relieving the ſombrous hue of the principal perſonages. I wiſh they may be conſidered as an *overcharged* picture of the vanity, extravagance, and ſelf-importance, that have for ſome years infected the middle claſſes of ſociety, threatning deſtruction to the ſound ſenſe, decent propriety, and manly virtues of this moſt *important* portion of the community."

The deſign is excellent, and the execution is equal to the conception. Sorry are we to ſay, that the characters are but too faithful repreſentations of nature, not, in the ſmalleſt degree, *overcharged*. The principal character, indeed, in high life, we mean that of the Marquis of Montolieu, is, if we may uſe the expreſſion, conſiderably *undercharged*; we could have ſupplied a few traits, taken from real life, which would have added very much to its infamy and guilt.—As we are among thoſe who have long thought that the habit which, of late years, the middle claſſes of ſociety have contracted, of aping the follies, the extravagancies, and the vices of their ſuperiors, is moſt fatally pernicious to the community, we cannot but give our hearty thanks to this lady for holding them up to the finger of ridicule, and to ſhew, that every attempt to change the order of the ſocial pyramid, whether by placing the bottom at the top, or the middle at the top, is alike abſurd and preſumptuous in itſelf, and ruinous in its conſequences, to its vain and fooliſh projectors.

The author, as an old acquaintance who has been ſome time abſent, juſtly thinks that her old friends and readers would wiſh to know ſomething of the preſent ſtate of her family affairs. She, therefore, tells us,

"My cat occupies the ſame corner of my fireſide which ſhe did many years ago, and Betty and I continue very well ſatisfied with each other. 'Tis true, her long waiſt, ſquare handkerchief, and clear muſlin apron, look very Gothic among the genteel dreſſes, long trains, and nodding plumes of the better ſort of Danbury Abigails, who I know have affirmed that ſhe is *deſolate* of common ſenſe. I have, however, an high opinion of her underſtanding; for ſhe is conſtantly of my way of thinking, and whenever I declaim againſt the times, ſhe pronounces them "*worſe and worſe.*"

None of our readers, we hope, will be ſo faſtidious as to quarrel with us for pronouncing this deſcription of *Betty* to be highly *intereſting*;—we can ſolemnly aſſure them it is ſo to *us*, and we will tell them *why*. We happen to have a *Betty* as well as our author, who exactly anſwers this deſcription, and who is endeared to us by exactly the

the ſame qualities, and the ſame coincidence of ſentiment and of language. Fatal as this confeſſion may be to a grave critic, we will not retract it, but even let it paſs, and conſign it, without apology, to the candour of our readers, only requeſting them to place the two *Bettys* among the jucunda oblivia vitæ.

We ſhall not attempt to analyze the ſtory of the Infidel Father, though, ſubordinate as it profeſſedly is, to the author's main deſign, it is certainly well managed, and neither deficient in ingenuity or intereſt; while the incidents are natural and the characters well preſerved. We wiſh our readers to peruſe the book itſelf, and therefore will not mar their curioſity by anticipation. We ſhall merely ſelect two or three paſſages, to ſhew that our opinion of its merits is not ill-founded. On the love of *novelty* the author's ſentiments are extremely *old-faſhioned.*

"Though the love of novelty, when combined with a pernicious contempt for eſtabliſhed uſages, and as pernicious a rage for raſh expedients, has produced moſt dreadful effects, not only in the great republic of Europe, but in the habits of private life; yet, like moſt of our natural deſires, if reſtrained within proper bounds, and directed to ſuitable objects, it may be lawfully indulged.

"For inſtance, propriety may ſuggeſt the want of a new garment, accommodation may hint the expediency of following a new faſhion, or laſſitude may indicate the utility of a change of occupation; in all theſe inſtances variety is lawful as well as charming. But let us not be craving for a new religion, a new government, a new ſyſtem of morals, or a new code of law. Some of thoſe things are in their nature *invariable*, and others are enhanced in value by that antiquity which has recorded their wiſdom and utility. Nor may the love of novelty extend to the deſire of a new huſband, or a new wife, while the old one remains to remind us of the permanence of a tie which was contracted for the term of our joint exiſtence. Inſtead of indulging factitious deſires, and faſtidious diſlikes, let us ſteadily examine the *real* value of what we poſſeſs; remembering, that nothing human can be perfect, that the failings which we are long accuſtomed to are become ſo familiar to our habits, that they may be borne; and the virtues which we have long proved are rendered ſo neceſſary to our comforts, that we cannot be deprived of them without experiencing a painful void. I might have extended theſe obſervations to old friends, old ſervants, and old cuſtoms, had I not recollected that the beginning of the chapter encouraged my readers to hope for a little novelty, and therefore my habitual proſing muſt ſeem unuſually unſeaſonable."

We ſhall juſt add that the lady might have included *old wine* in the liſt of her commendable antiquities. To the improvement of the preſent age in faſhionable accompliſhments our author bears ample teſtimony, in her brief delineation of the character of Lord Glanville, the *Infidel Father* of the *vieille cour.*

"Hypocriſy is termed the tribute that vice pays to virtue. It is, indeed, an acknowledgment of ſuperiority; and, though I deteſt deceit, I cannot think that manners are improved by the ſinner's not only proclaiming

ing his crimes with unblushing effrontery, but even with inverted ambition aspiring to more infamy than he is justly heir to. Reputation was the idol that Lord Glanville worshipped; he wished to be considered as the first man of the age; but he was educated in that old school of manners which deprived the jockey, the brute, the boor, and the buffoon, of all hopes of attaining that enviable distinction. He had been taught, that if the morals of the man did not at least seem to regard decorum, an indelible shade would be thrown over his public character. He was, indeed, well assured that his lady's attachment to Major Mitford, to whom she had been formerly engaged, continued in full force; nay, that he visited her at her villa, doubtless to join in her regrets for her husband's absence. But his lordship certainly never reached the summit of connubial liberality; for he did not profess friendship to the man whom he suspected of supplanting him in the affections of his wedded partner. I am persuaded that he never drove the major in his phaeton; and, though they both ranked high in the beau monde, they were never seen arm in arm in Bond-street, nor lounging together at a fruiterer's. I question if the most spirited woman of high ton would have *dared*, even for a frolic, to have complimented the Glanvilles by inviting the major to meet them. Nay, I have been informed by unquestionable authority, that the countess had never courage enough to be seen in public with her supposed gallant. I think it my duty to be very explicit in stating these circumstances, as I am aware that the revolution which has taken place in vice within these last twenty years must make such of my young readers as are hackneyed in modern manners think that I sketch the portrait of a *civil* husband with very faint colours. They have heard of men who have gloried in the criminality of their consorts; of gentlemen who trade in adultery, and seek to repair a falling fortune with the spoils of female reputation; of concerted crimes, of convenient crim-cons, of useful absences, and all the diabolical et-ceteras that form the dreadful traffic of conjugal infidelity. But I must inform them, that before philosophism and infidelity systematized depravity, confounded names and natures, and termed criminal indulgences fulfilling the grand laws of our existence, guilt was contented with *impunity*, and did not ask for *fame*. The willing wittol did not then creep from his den of infamy, and bid justice tremble on its awful bench while he demanded a *reward* for being the most *contemptible* of mankind."

We heartily wish that some of our *fashionable* characters, in the different classes of society, would avail themselves of our author's hints, in order to trace effects to their true causes, and to pave the way for a *radical reform* in their own principles and conduct. But we must exhibit some other features of this infidel character,

"Lord Glanville's manners were formed in the school of Chesterfield, that is to say, they were corrected by the opinion of the world, and restrained by prudential and interested motives. He had imbibed many of his early opinions from Shaftsbury and Bolingbroke; his prejudices against religion received insuperable strength from the sarcasms of Voltaire; and in the varying sophisms of Rousseau he found convincing arguments against revelation. Yet, as his political creed led him to acknowlege the utility of religion as a state engine, he considered that it would be both indecorous and unwise for a member of the highest court of legislature to ridicule

rule publicly what was eſſential to the well-being of the community, and intimately interwoven with the principles of the conſtitution. Except, therefore, in the company of his moſt choſen intimates, Lord Glanville never indulged his ſecret rancour, farther than by a ſlight inuendo againſt the wiles of prieſtcraft, or a general invective on the evils of bigotry and ſuperſtition. He ever made it a rule to attend divine ſervice twice during his reſidence at his country ſeat; and, like Rouſſeau's exemplary Savoyard, with outward propriety, and inward incredulity, he mocked his Maker with the lip-homage of an unbelieving heart. I muſt allow, that Lord Glanville's deiſm was far ſhort of the candour and philoſophy of our preſent theophilanthropiſts; for he patronized charity-ſchools, and all other means of promoting religious knowledge among the lower claſſes. He even went ſo far as to inſiſt on a ſerious ſenſe of duty, among the requiſites that form the uſual inquiries in the choice of a ſervant; for he ſeemed to think infidelity a ſort of ariſtocratic privilege, and, like the myſteries of Ceres, improper to be diſcloſed to the profane. So far from wiſhing the whole human race to riſe in rebellion againſt their Creator, he would not have been diſpleaſed if only himſelf and a few choſen aſſociates had been releaſed from the thraldom of future reſponſibility. From theſe principles we may readily conceive what muſt be his ruling paſſion. Selfiſhneſs was the predominant quality in Lord Glanville's mind; and, indeed, we may call it a conſtituent part of every infidel. The unfortunate being whoſe hopes terminate on this ſide the grave muſt endeavour to make the beſt of his little all of exiſtence: for, as he denies reverſionary bleſſings, he cannot afford to part with a preſent good; and the well-founding ideas of moral fitneſs and general utility, when balanced againſt the cravings of appetite, will fly up 'and kick the beam.'

"I am aware that I continually lay myſelf open to the cenſure of illiberality, and upon the preſent occaſion I wiſh to ſpeak by the card. I by no means deny that deiſts have ſometimes performed great and generous actions; I only aſſert that they cannot feel benevolence and magnanimity. The mammon of unrighteouſneſs, like the falſe deities of paganiſm, varies its form, and different offerings muſt be prepared for its different altars.—It is not always the voluptuous Pan, the ſordid Plutus, or the ambitious Phaeton: it often wears a more decorous form, and paſſes for the goddeſs of worldly wiſdom. Lord Glanville's idol was the love of praiſe; and many ſpecious actions and much regard to appearance are required from thoſe who live upon the aërial food of adulation and popular applauſe. I much doubt whether a mind, in which this agitating paſſion prevails over principle and ſober reaſon, does not endure greater privations than thoſe of the anchoret. But this is not the only inſtance in which the ſlaves of ſin ſubmit to ſeverer bondage than religion ever requires from her ſincereſt votaries.

"The man who, rejecting the ſupremacy of Omniſcience, regulates his conduct by the conſideration of what the world will ſay of him, quits a ſure and laſting recompenſe for ſolicitude and diſappointment. Lord Glanville's hiſtory is deſigned to exemplify this obſervation; he purſued fame by indirect courſes, and he reaped diſappointment."

May ſimilar purſuits ever be productive of ſimilar diſappointments! It was natural enough that ſuch a philoſopher as Lord Glanville ſhould wiſh his daughter to be as great a philoſopher as himſelf.

"Lord

"Lord Glanville intended that his daughter, though feminine in her perſon, and attractive in her manners, ſhould poſſeſs a maſculine mind, and be in every reſpect ſuperior to the little vanities, weakneſſes, and terrors of her ſex. Her taſte was to be correct, her judgment unclouded by bigotry, her temper unruffled by any ſtrong paſſions, all her actions were to be guided by prudence, and virtue was to be the conſtant inhabitant of her boſom. Not that humble virtue, which, conſcious of human frailty, looks continually to divine ſupport, but virtue as exhibited in the beautiful viſions of Plato and other heathen moraliſts, ſtern, undeviating, ſelf-confident, unrelenting, virtue; a quality which, if it *ever* exiſted, is at leaſt not congenial to the nature of frail, dependent man.

"As to her behaviour to himſelf, he propoſed that ſhe ſhould comfort him for all his paſt diſappointments and ſorrows. She was to be his friend, his confidant, his conſtant companion. Her attachment to him was to be quite diſtinct from the ties of nature, becauſe ſhe was to be inſtructed that thoſe ties are merely the bond of prejudice. It was not to be the reſult of duty; becauſe duty implies obligation, and muſt therefore be unſuitable to the nature of an independent, reflecting being.—I ſhall get bewildered in this maze of metaphyſics if I proceed further; and as I really do not underſtand this ſcheme of filtering our feelings, I will only ſtate the effects of it. After Lady Caroline's regard for her father had been purified from the *ſcum* of natural affection, and the *droſs* of filial duty, common obſervers could not perceive that *any* was left."

Our readers will eaſily perceive that by following ſuch a pair as this through life; and obſerving cloſely the conduct naturally reſulting from the principles which they adopted, much uſeful inſtruction may be acquired. We lament that our limits preclude us from laying before them the whole of that chapter in the ſecond volume, in which the author "throws down the gauntlet of controverſy; or, in other words, defends what former ages conſidered as *moſt* valuable and *moſt* wiſe." It is replete with ſound, judicious, and moſt uſeful doctrine. The advice to her own ſex, contained in the following paſſage, will be regarded as an inſult by the female diſciples of the Godwinian ſchool, the philoſophiſtical aſſertors of the *rights*, and the proud avengers of the *wrongs*, of women.

"Projects are generally unfortunate things to young ladies. Indeed I have a general diſlike to them; and I have ſo often ſeen the quickneſs of female feeling betray the moſt profound ſcheme of female ſubtlety, that I have never regretted our excluſion from political rights, though ſome of my ſiſter authors have lamented it with pathetic and ſomewhat acrimonious ſuſceptibility. I am, indeed, convinced that a *female* parliament would not only (to uſe a quaint phraſe) be continually flying off in a tangent, but that a *female* adminiſtration would be ſo ſoon out-generalled by a *male* oppoſition, that it is not worth while to ſtruggle for a ſupremacy which we want circumſpection to render permanent. And, ſince unſucceſsful reſiſtance always incurs the odious name of rebellion, it is perhaps the wiſeſt courſe to conform to the long eſtabliſhed treaty which has ſubſiſted between us and our preſent governors (though ſome of the articles are certainly inconvenient), leſt we ſhould, by an ill-concerted inſurrection, give them a plea for ſtricter coercion. My fair readers may be aſſured that, though

though I make this free ſtatement of my opinion, I ſhall not omit to put in a ſaving clauſe in favour of our right to *remonſtrate*, which is a very ancient branch of the female prerogative, and cannot be given up.

" To apply theſe obſervations to private life: I am ſo thoroughly convinced of the general unfitneſs of my ſex for any thing that wears the appearance of plot, chicanery, and deep deſign, that I would ſtrongly adviſe my fair readers never to have recourſe to ſuch ſurreptitious aſſiſtance, but to reſt their actions on the firm baſis of integrity, candour, and generous frankneſs; with this ſole reſervation, that they put theſe noble qualities under the guidance of diſcretion. An artful woman is a monſter, and generally a fool. I would particularly adviſe all *ſpinſters* under the age of five and twenty never to attempt to outwit a lover who is not fairly turned of his grand climacteric. If he be, I not only allow that amorous threeſcore and ten is fair game, but that it is eaſily caught, even by the ſimplicity of eighteen, and generally without any aſſiſtance from the lady mother: it is, therefore, lawful to turn it to the beſt advantage."

The reflections in the laſt volume on the profligacy of modern huſbands, and on adultery in general, are ſuch as might be expected to flow from a mind formed on, and regulated by, true Chriſtian principles, unadulterated by any of the vicious refinements of the new morality. Speaking of the propoſed admiſſion to virtuous company of a woman who had committed adultery, and afterwards married the guilty object of her criminal paſſion, the author remarks: " It is an eminently proper, though I am told a peculiar trait in the character of Britiſh ladies, to diſtinguiſh between a *tarniſhed* and an *unſpotted* reputation, even when the ſtains on the former ſeem to have been waſhed away by the tears of true contrition. *We judge nothing ſo ſuitable for a penitent as a retired life, and domeſtic reſpectability.*"

Such indeed were *once* the virtuous ſentiments which diſtinguiſhed the females of this happy iſland; but, alas! with heartfelt ſorrow, we acknowledge the humiliating fact, that the moral principle of the female mind has, within the laſt ſeven years, been materially weakened. The nice ſenſe of religion and of honour, whence originated the plain and broad diſtinction between virtue and vice, has been eſſentially impaired. Propriety has been ſacrificed at the ſhrine of Vanity. An adultereſs, not penitent, but glorying in her ſin, and thus adding impudence to infamy, is a character *now* not merely *received* but *courted*. Nay, even the doors of the puritanic peer, who affects ſuperior purity of principle and of conduct, are thrown open to her, and courtly thouſands called to witneſs her triumph. The moral order of ſociety indeed ſeems, in this inſtance, to be inverted. Princely pomp not unfrequently diſtinguiſhes the brazen adultereſs, where the white ſheet alone ſhould mark the penitent proſtitute. Pride and puritaniſm are aſſociated to degrade the female character, by introducing guilt into the manſions of innocence; by encouraging diſobedience to the poſitive precepts of the Deity; by paying homage to Sin; and by utterly deſtroying all the value of reputation. When we daily witneſs this profligate ſcene, exhibited openly to the world; when

when we see Pride itself personified, making an adulterous arrangement with his bride for the systematic and unrestrained commission of double adultery, and when we find the press, which ought to be the guardian of public morals, either silent or worse than silent on the subject, while those whose bounden duty it is to mark all vicious courses with abhorrence, shew encouragement instead of reprobation, we cannot but conceive this moral revolution to be the precursor of some violent political convulsion that will shake the fair fabric of the British monarchy to its very basis. The slave of dissipation, or the victim of folly, can alone regard with indifference this fatal tendency to a general depravity of manners, to a general contempt of religious and moral principle. The day of retribution *must* come, and who will presume to say, that the people who seem to have been selected as the scourge of Europe, will not be chosen as the instruments for inflicting a dreadful punishment on the sins of this nation. On the eve of the dreadful contest in which we are about to embark, these reflections are at least seasonable, however unacceptable they may prove to many; feasts should now give way to fasts, pride to humiliation, and pomp to penitence. That *nothing is so suitable to a penitent as a retired life* is a truth that ought to be deeply impressed on the minds of penitents of both sexes. On the attention of *one* of the male sex we earnestly press it; reminding him, that if he persevere in his efforts to obtrude himself on the notice of a world, by which it is his interest to be forgotten, he will probably be noticed in such a way as will make him wish for retirement as strongly as he now courts notoriety.

In conclusion, we recommend this novel to our readers, as one which, though it may have been exceeded by many in ingenuity and wit, yields to none in good sense, judicious observation, useful instruction, and sound principle.

Gentz's *State of Europe before and after the French Revolution.*

(Concluded from Vol. XIV. p. 300.)

HAVING followed this able politician through two important heads of his Enquiry, in answer to the false statements and scandalous perversions of the consular advocate, Citizen Hauterive, we now proceed to examine the conclusion of his argument, in which he discusses the question, whether there existed at the beginning of the French revolution any public law in Europe? The consideration of which leads him, lastly, to take a just and comprehensive view of the relative state of the different powers of Europe, at that period.

"The author (Hauterive) is not satisfied with giving a decided negative to this question. He goes farther, and draws a gloomy and depressing picture of the social constitution of Europe, in the last years which preceded the revolution. 'It was impossible not to observe' (such are the expressions he

he makes uſe of), 'that there had long ſince ceaſed to exiſt any maxims of government, any federal union, any fixed political principles in Europe; that an imaginary principle of aggrandizement, in fact nothing more than a forcible, unnatural, and deſtructive exertion, had faſcinated all governments; that the powers of Europe were involved in general miſery; that bankruptcy ſtood at the door of every government; and that a ſingle nation, graſping at the riches of all the reſt, converted the misfortune of the whole to its own excluſive advantage: that the ſame cauſes which produced the diſorganization of ſociety in France, had ſown the ſeeds of political anarchy throughout the whole of Europe; that the law of nations no longer exiſted, except in appearance; and that the revolution was only a loud and formal annunciation of its long-determined diſſolution."

The fallacy of this monſtrous poſition is clearly demonſtrated by Mr. Gentz, in a maſterly expoſition of the views, reſources, and ſituation of the different potentates.

"I am convinced," he ſays, "and I truſt that all enlightened perſons will now agree with me, that the condition of Europe in the latter times preceding the revolution, was not ſo deſperate either in a ſocial, a domeſtic, or a federative point of view, as to lead immediately to violent convulſions; or to render ſuch convulſions deſirable; that the French revolution, though facilitated, and in that ſenſe prepared, by many ſocial and political diſcordances, was by no means a neceſſary or unavoidable conſequence of the ſtate of France, much leſs of Europe; that this event, with all its dreadful conſequences, was occaſioned by ſome obvious errors of the former French government—was continued and completed by the untimely zeal, the ill-adviſed activity, the inability, the preſumption, or the wickedneſs of thoſe who, in conſequence of theſe errors, were intruſted with the direction of the public affairs—and was converted into a principle of deſtruction for all Europe by the improvident meaſures of the ſurrounding nations; that, far from furthering the improvement of the condition of civil and political ſociety, this revolution, on the contrary, has interrupted and arreſted its progreſs at a moment when it appeared particularly promiſing; and that, when conſidered in a more extenſive point of view, the greateſt and moſt lamentable of the evils which accompanied it, was this: before the revolution there only needed a few wiſe reforms in the internal conſtitutions of ſtates, and ſome happy combinations for ameliorating and confirming the federal ſyſtem, to have raiſed Europe to a high degree of proſperity and happineſs; whereas now all the means of attaining to this deſired object muſt be ſought for amidſt a heap of ruins, and drawn forth, as it were, from chaos again."

This is unqueſtionably true. The boaſted regeneration of France has done more to injure the cauſe of real liberty, and to retard the progreſs of uſeful knowledge, in twelve years, than the moſt deſpotic conduct of the moſt abſolute ſovereign could have done in half a century. In a political and moral point of view the evils which it has produced are incalculable. Mr. Burke has been ridiculed by his enemies for having repreſented the ſpace which France formerly occupied in the map of Europe as a blank; but who will dare to deny that in the map of freedom it is a perfect blank; and had the *ability* of the tyrant which rules that devoted country been commen-

ſurate with his *will*, all Europe would, at this moment, exhibit the ſame mournful appearance.

Mr. G. aſcribes the dreadful ſtorms which convulſed the political world, at the cloſe of the 18th century, to a reſtleſs and ill-regulated ſpirit of innovation, ariſing out of encreaſed opulence and extended knowledge. His remarks on the ſtate of Poland, and on the circumſtances which led to the eraſure of its name from the liſt of independent ſtates, are too curious and important to be omitted here.

"It may, perhaps, at the firſt glance, look ſomewhat like temerity, to mention the unfortunate kingdom of POLAND, in an account of the progreſs and improvement of the different ſtates of Europe. But even in this retarded and neglected country, the dawn of a brighter day had begun, ſhortly before its diſſolution, to enlighten the horizon. No eſſential improvement was in this inſtance practicable without a thorough reform of the conſtitution; for the errors in the conſtitution were the real cauſes of the decay and weakneſs of the ſtate. This firſt object had, however, already occupied the attention of all thinking perſons; and the partition of 1772, with all its evil conſequences, had one beneficial effect for Poland; it pointed out, in the cleareſt and moſt impreſſive manner, the neceſſity of a great political regeneration. The patriotic zeal of the friends of a radical reform, and the general conviction of its neceſſity, firſt brought it forward as an object of public conſideration, at the diet, in 1788. The reſult of this diet is well known: the conſtitution of 1791 was the preſage of a happier fortune, the beginning of a new ſtate of exiſtence, conformable to the ſpirit of the times, and the progreſs of civilization in the reſt of Europe. This is not the place to review the ſeries of events, by which this conſtitution was deſtroyed in the moment of its birth, and Poland for ever ſtruck out of the liſt of nations. But there is one obſervation which applies immediately to my argument, and will be ſubſcribed to without difficulty by every impartial reader acquainted with the hiſtory of modern times: had it not been for the French revolution, the conſtitution of 1791 would not have been deſtroyed, nor the political independence of Poland annihilated."

This was always our opinion upon that ſubject, and we are happy to ſee it confirmed by ſo competent a judge, and ſo attentive an obſerver as Mr. G. The partition of Poland, then, may be added as another proof of the injury done to rational freedom, by this horrible revolution. On the ſtate of France alſo, previous to the revolution, the author's obſervations are equally judicious and ſatisfactory.

"In order to complete this review of the ſtates of Europe, we muſt, in the laſt place, direct our attention to the central point of the revolution; the country out of which its ſplendid promiſes, and its dreadful devaſtations, have immediately proceeded. That the former government of FRANCE was ſuch as ſtood in need of the greateſt reforms; that the errors in its legiſlation, its adminiſtration, and its domeſtic conſtitution, were many and great, cannot for a moment be diſputed. Nobody will attempt to deny that the government of Lewis the XVth laid the foundation of a dangerous diſorganization. But was the reign of LEWIS XVI. from its commencement to its tragical end, a proof of the aſſertion, that there no longer exiſted any proper principles of government in Europe? Was it not rather marked throughout

throughout by the desire of beneficial reforms, the prevailing character of the times? Was not its only misfortune a misconception of its strength, which sank under the weight of its own undertakings? Was the monarch who placed TURGOT and MALESHERBES among the number of his ministers, who twice intrusted the fate of his kingdom to the hands of NECKER, was he a patron of abuses, a blind follower of former systems? Was the *convocation of the* NOTABLES, and the plan for which they were convened, the work of mean, contemptible, obscure, and common-place politics? Was the facility, or rather the levity with which this government consented to the assembling of the States, a proof of tenacious obstinacy, or of an imprudent spirit of concession? Was the edict of the 5th July 1788, which not only established the freedom of the press, but called upon every hand that could guide a pen to employ itself in publishing plans of general utility, —was that edict the measure of a court that trembled at every prospect of innovation? Was the decree of the council of state of the 27th December 1788, and the speech of the minister of finance of the 5th May 1789, and even the unfortunate declaration of the 23d May—were these the productions of a government far behind the wishes and opinions of its enlightened subjects? Is the revolution, in short, to be attributed to the want of system and principles; or, on the contrary, to the superfluity and abuse of them?"

Having thus shewn, in contradiction to Mr. Hauterive, that "Europe possessed, in every reasonable sense of the word, a federative constitution, a political balance, and a law of nations," Mr. G. thus proceeds.

"To explain these truths, it will not be necessary to descend to a minute and particular analysis of the political relations existing at that period. It is sufficient if we dwell upon the leading features of the picture. The fate of Europe depends upon the fortunes and political relations of the powers which preponderate in the general system. If the balance be preserved among these; if their political existence and internal organization be safely established; if, by their mutual action and reaction, they protect and secure the independence of the smaller states (so much, at least, as the weak can be secure in a community with the strong); if there is no dangerous preponderance to be perceived, which threatens to oppress the rest, or to involve them in endless war; we may rest satisfied with the federal constitution which fulfils these most essential points, notwithstanding many errors and defects. And such was the federal constitution of Europe before the French revolution."

Such indeed *was* the federal constitution of Europe at that period, but what is it *now?* The very reverse of this; for there "is a dangerous preponderance to be perceived which threatens to oppress the rest, or to involve them in endless war." And without the utter destruction of that preponderance, to effect which *all* the powers of Europe *ought* to combine, there will be neither peace nor safety for any of them. Mr. G. concludes this head of his enquiry with a summary of the facts which he has proved in it.

"1st, That, during the period we have been speaking of, the political security of France was as great and as firmly established in every essential point, as could be desired or imagined: that her geographical situation, the

nature of her frontiers, the magnitude of her internal reſources, and even the general intereſts of ſurrounding nations, combined not only to ſupport that ſecurity, but to enſure it in the completeſt manner.

" 2dly, That the influence of France in the federal ſyſtem of Europe was fully adequate to her real, political importance; that it was diminiſhed ſince the time of Lewis XIV. by ſo much only has it had then been carried too far; and that it was owing to the temporary errors of a weak adminiſtration, not to any unfavourable change in the balance of power, nor to a poſitive decreaſe of this influence itſelf, that it failed in ſome particular inſtances to operate with energy and effect.

" 3dly, That France, till the commencement of the revolution, was feared by all the greater powers; while her friendſhip and favour were ſought and cultivated by moſt of the ſmaller; that her relations with Germany were more ſtable and advantageous than in any other period of modern hiſtory; that every apprehenſion Ruſſia might occaſion was ſufficiently counteracted by the ſituation of the other powers; that her alliances, her patronage, or her policy, enabled her to govern, excluſively or principally, in all the ſouthern ſtates of Europe; in Spain, in the greater part of Italy, in Switzerland, and in Conſtantinople; and that the loſs of influence ſuſtained by the partition of Poland in the year 1772, was repaired by a more ſolid and effective connexion with Sweden.

" 4thly and laſtly, That France, conſidered as a maritime ſtate, was more than once the ſucceſsful rival of the only nation ſhe had cauſe to fear; that her inferiority was never permanent; and that the laſt naval war in this period was the moſt ſucceſsful and honourable ſhe had ever waged againſt England."

In the third and laſt part of this ſyſtematic diſcuſſion, the author takes a view of the preſent relations between France and the other ſtates of Europe, in the courſe of which he fully juſtifies the Engliſh againſt the unjuſt charges preferred againſt them by the ſhameleſs pandars of the French government, on the ground of their *commercial tyranny*. It is no prejudice in favour of our own country, though in ſuch prejudice we certainly glory, which prompts us to aſſert, that in this branch of his enquiry the author proves himſelf a complete maſter of his ſubject, which he diſcuſſes with equal ability and judgment. It is impoſſible, however, for us to follow him through it; and we have leſs reaſon to lament this circumſtance as we are perſuaded the book itſelf will be, as it deſerves, generally read. The copious account which we have given of it ſufficiently ſhews our ſenſe of its merits; and we ſhall now cloſe that account with the author's concluding remark on the *object* of Hauterive's publication, which is alſo the favourite object of his maſter.

" Adhering to his falſe premiſes, he has mixed theſe propoſals with others more doubtful and equivocal. 'The commercial connexions of nations are to be founded upon better regulations;' 'Their rights and obligations are to be defined by better treaties.' Wherein theſe better treaties and wiſer combinations are to conſiſt, remains totally unexplained; but the ſecret aim and true character of his propoſals are betrayed, not only by numerous expreſſions in various parts of his work, and the general tendency of his politics, but by his explanation of what he himſelf calls the moſt

important

important article, which is an undefined recommendation of a new political ſyſtem of commercial relations. He thinks nothing more is requiſite than a 'ſingle ray of light, to ſhow to a few princes and their miniſters, the real cauſes of their political and commercial dependance, and the true principle of their deliverance;' and he adds, 'The preſent ſtate of things might be immediately changed by the energy of one great power, and that power is France.'

"From theſe declarations, it is evident he did not expect the improvement of European induſtry, the deliverance of commerce, the proſperity and independence of all nations, either entirely or principally from the reformation of interior adminiſtrations, the freedom of trade, the improvement of domeſtic polity, or the wiſdom of governments. Such truly beneficial cauſes operate ſlowly, and in regular progreſſion. The mere reſolution of a few princes, or the energy of a ſingle power, may inſtantly alter the courſe of things, and change the nature of all relations. It is evident that he looks to ſimple, bold, and deciſive political meaſures, for what he calls the deliverance of Europe; and that he ſeeks to exalt France, and Europe eventually with France, by weakening or deſtroying the foundation of Britain's greatneſs, by means of certain combinations, which he conceals for the preſent, though they are eaſily diſcovered. His favourite object therefore is, the immediate degradation of England; which, according to the principles above explained, is ſufficient to warrant his condemnation."

Regeneration ſtated and explained according to Scripture and Antiquity, in a Diſcourſe on Titus iii. 4, 5, 6. By Daniel Waterland, D. D. late Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majeſty. A new Edition. Rivingtons. 8vo. Pp. 61. 1s. 6d. 1802.

WE have to apologize to our readers for having ſo long delayed to announce to them, the republication of this admirable diſcourſe, to the peruſal of which we are perſuaded the name of Waterland will be ſo powerful an inducement, that our recommendation will be ſuperfluous; "its title," as the editors remark, "will ſufficiently account for its revival;" for, to adopt their language, "Regeneration is a hard word, and a very ſerious thing; and is now bandied about, rather indecently, by many *who neither know what they ſay nor whereof they affirm.*" We take leave, however, to remark, that the ſtrongeſt expreſſion which language can furniſh ſhould be ſubſtituted in the place of this very moderate one here uſed, to characterize the indecency complained of, an indecency, now, alas! not confined to the conventicle, but tolerated, nay *encouraged*, within the church, having been of late, in too many inſtances, rewarded with preferment.* We think the preſs, therefore, has ſcarcely ever produced

---

* We allude to the circumſtance of Mr. Overton having been preſented, by the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, to two livings in York, at

duced a more ſeaſonable publication than that now before us.—— The plan purſued by the author, in treating of this important ſubject, is thus laid down by himſelf.

" 1ſt. To explain the name and notion of '*regeneration*;' ſhewing what it is, and what it contains; as alſo what concern it has with Chriſtian baptiſm, called the '*laver*' or fountain of it.

" 2dly. To conſider what the '*renewing*,' mentioned in the text, means; and how it differs from or agrees with '*regeneration*,' and what connection both of them have with *baptism* here, and with *salvation* hereafter.

" 3dly. To draw ſome proper *inferences* from the whole, for preventing miſtakes in theſe high matters, and for our better improvement in Chriſtian knowledge and practice."

It will at once be perceived how very comprehenſive is our author's deſign, and how very perſpicuous is his arrangement. The ſame perſpicuity prevails throughout, and much as he promiſes, his performance exceeds the expectation raiſed; he ſeems to have contemplated his ſubject in every poſſible light in which it could be placed, and not only ſupports his own hypotheſis with great ſtrength and variety of reaſoning, but obviates, as he proceeds, every objection likely to be urged againſt it.

Thus he accounts for the introduction of the term regeneration into the Goſpel.

" The name or notion probably was not altogether *new* in our Lord's time: for the *Jews* had been uſed to admit converts from heatheniſm into the Jewiſh church by a *baptism* of their own, and they called the admiſſion or reception of ſuch converts by the name of regeneration, as it was ſomewhat like the bringing them into a *new world*. Such *proſelytes* were conſidered as *dead* to their former ſtate of darkneſs, and *born anew* to light, liberty, and privileges among the children of *Israel*, and within the church of God. The figure was eaſy, natural and affecting, and therefore our Lord was pleaſed in his conference with Nicodemus to adopt the ſame kind of language, applying it to the caſe of admitting converts both from *Judaism* and *Paganism* into Chriſtianity; transferring and ſanctifying the rite, the figure, and the name, to higher and nobler, but ſtill *ſimilar*, purpoſes. Indeed he *improved* the notion by the addition of the *ſpirit*, and he *enlarged* the uſe of the rite, by ordering that *every one*, every convert to Chriſtianity, ſhould be baptiſed."

The origin of the term is here very clearly traced out, and, in the ſumming up of the firſt head of the diſcourſe, its import is thus no leſs ſatisfactorily ſtated.

" *Regeneration complete* ſtands in two things, which are, as it were, its two *integral* parts; the *grant* made over to the perſon, and the *reception* of

---

the requeſt of Mr. *Wilberforce!!!* On this ſubject, however, we mean to addreſs a letter to his lordſhip fully expreſſive of our ſentiments of an act, which we cannot but conſider as an act of eccleſiaſtical ſuicide.

that

that grant. The grant once made *continues* always the ſame; but the reception may *vary*, becauſe it depends upon the condition of the recipient."

We beg to recommend this extract to very particular attention, as it diſſolves that ſpell of our modern puritans by which they faſcinate ſo many into thoſe ſtrong deluſions which their cunning craftineſs hath contrived, and ſo inebriate them with ſpiritual pride, that it is almoſt hopeleſs to attempt to recover them from their ſtate of intoxication.

The diſtinction between regeneration and renovation, "the waſhing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt," is, in the next place, admirably laid down by this perſpicuous and moſt accurate divine; who has illuſtrated this part of his ſubject, in particular, in a more ſatisfactory manner, than any other writer we have met with. Theſe terms are frequently, nay, almoſt always, confounded, by thoſe who contend for the inefficacy of the ſacrament of baptiſm, and the neceſſity of a converſion, after baptiſm, from a ſtate of nature to a ſtate of grace. With *them*, regeneration and renovation appear to be one and the ſame thing, and, conſequently, all thoſe paſſages in Holy Writ, which ſpeak of the neceſſity of being renewed, transformed, and the like, *they* ſeem to conſider as ſtrictly *ſynonymous* with being born of the ſpirit, &c.; whereas, Dr. W. clearly ſhows, that the term regeneration relates excluſively to *baptiſm*, being expreſſive "of the *ſpiritual ſtate*, conſidered *at large*," wherein we are placed by baptiſm; while renovation denotes either the ſubſequent *renewal* of the inner man, when decayed by actual ſin, or elſe the "capacity and qualification in adults who are yet unbaptized, for receiving regeneration by baptiſm." Accordingly it is remarked, that "though we find no ſcripture exhortations made to *Chriſtians* (for Nicodemus was a *Jew)* to become *regenerated*, yet we meet with ſeveral exhortations to them to be again and again *renewed*." This is further ſhewn to be doctrine entirely conformable with the language of the Church of England, in whoſe Liturgy we pray, "that we, being *regenerate*, and made God's children by adoption and grace, may daily be *renewed* by his Holy Spirit." Nothing can more clearly ſhew that theſe are terms of perfectly diſtinct ſignification according to the uſage of Scripture and the Liturgy of our Church; and that regeneration has reference ſolely to the work of the ſpirit in baptiſm, while renovation refers to the work of the ſame ſpirit, ſubſequent or preparatory to that holy ſacrament, by which alone man is born again and made an heir of everlaſting ſalvation. Many other diſtinctions are pointed out between theſe two words, upon a right underſtanding of which conſiderably depends a clear apprehenſion of the nature of the baptiſmal covenant. Our author ſets it, however, in the cleareſt light, by applying his remarks to four ſpecial caſes.—"1. The caſe of *grown* perſons coming to baptiſm in their *integrity*, and ſo continuing afterwards. 2. The caſe of *infants* brought in their *innocency*, and 'leading the reſt of their lives according to that

beginning.' 3. The caſe of ſuch grown perſons or infants ſo baptized, but falling off afterwards. 4. The caſe of grown perſons coming to baptiſm in *hypocriſy* or *impenitency*; but repenting afterwards and turning to God."—From all theſe it appears, that faith and repentance (which conſtitute *renovation*) do not *regenerate* men without *baptiſm*; that baptiſm alone regenerates once for all, ſo that "a perſon once ſavingly regenerated, and afterwards loſing all the *ſalutary* uſe of it, will not want *to be regenerated* again, or *born anew*, but to be *reformed* only;" and, in ſhort, that "perfect regeneration is to the *ſpiritual* life, what *perfect health* is to the *natural*; and the *recoveries* of the ſpiritual health, time after time, are not a *new* regeneration, but a reſtoring or improving of the *old*."

This learned and ſound expoſitor of God's word then proceeds to his propoſed *inference* from the two preceding heads of his diſcourſe; applying them in a moſt edifying and impreſſive manner, by way of antidote to the prevailing errors of enthuſiaſts, upon theſe favourite topics of their crude and fanciful declamation. He notices the miſtakes "ariſing from the miſinterpreting ſome texts, (as John iii. 5. and alſo Tit. iii. 5.) which plainly import a *water-baptiſm*, or an inward baptiſm of the *ſpirit* only; whence, by degrees, *outward* baptiſm came to be thrown out of the idea of *regeneration*." He thus cenſures alſo a very common, though *improper* and *miſchievous*, practice, "telling the common people, that they ought now to be *regenerated*, which few will rightly underſtand, inſtead of telling them plainly, that they ought, with the help of God's grace, ſpeedily to *repent* and *amend*, (which is all the meaning, if it has any good meaning) is giving them only a *dark* leſſon, inſtead of a *clear* one, and throwing miſts before their eyes in a moſt momentous article nearly affecting Chriſtian practice, and the ſpiritual life." Again; he notices the danger of ſpiritual pride, and the manner in which it too readily inſinuates itſelf into the minds of even well-diſpoſed perſons. "If none but *hypocrites* or *ill-deſigning* men were to be drawn into this ſnare, the temptation would be *coarſely* laid, and be the leſs apt to deceive: but the *well meaning* pretenders to the *ſpirit*, who through a ſecret unperceived *ſelf-flattery*, or a complexional melancholy, firſt deceive *themſelves*, *they* are, of all men, the fitteſt to deceive *others*." As a caution againſt being miſled by any ſuppoſed impulſe of the Holy Spirit, he lays down a plain rule for judging "whether it comes from *Satan*, (if it be really *ſupernatural*) or from the *Spirit of God*. If *God in the ſoul* (as ſome term it) commands any thing contrary to *God in the Bible*; as, for inſtance, to be *diſobedient* to lawful ſuperiors in things good and lawful, to break comely *order* and *regularity*," &c. &c. "then may we be aſſured, that it is not the God of heaven that does it, but the *God of this world*, (if any) which ſometimes *blinds the minds of them that believe not, leſt the glorious goſpel of Chriſt* (the *ſovereign* rule of Chriſtian faith and conduct) *ſhould ſhine upon them*." One more remark only we ſhall quote, of the ſame excellent

cellent tendency, and which well deſerves to be attended to by many of the preſumptuous railers of the preſent day. "He that is *led* by the ſpirit, and *walks* by the *written* rules of the ſpirit, he, and he only, can upon ſure grounds ſay, that he *has the ſpirit*. And when he can ſay it, let him ſay it to *himſelf*, and to *God* (whom he ought to thank for ſo ineſtimable a bleſſing); and let him not raſhly *boaſt* of it before the world, nor cenſoriouſly *judge* or *deſpiſe* others; for that would be directly copying after the *proud Phariſee*, and would infallibly *quench the ſpirit.*"

We have already extended this article ſo much beyond the uſual length of reviewing a ſingle ſermon, that we muſt forbear indulging ourſelves with further extracts. But it were an injuſtice to this eminently uſeful performance, not to notice the very copious and learned *references*, which it contains, to ancient and modern authors of the moſt deſerved reputation. The ſtudent in theology who ſhall purſue the courſe of reading here pointed out to him, will find his labours amply rewarded, by the rich ſtores of piety and wiſdom that will be laid open to his view; and he can hardly fail of being completely armed againſt the errors of the times, which are indeed ſo often blended with truth, or veiled under the moſt inſidious ſophiſtry, that it requires no common degree of learning, ſolidity, and penetration, to be able to diſcern and expoſe their fallacy.

Upon theſe grounds, we eſteem ourſelves greatly obliged to the editors, for their judicious and ſeaſonable republication of this maſterly performance; and we rejoice to hear of the probability, through the ſame channel, of other tracts of ſimilar merit and tendency being ſhortly reprinted.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

The Satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis, translated into Engliſh Verſe. By Wm. Gifford, Eſq. Quarto. Pp. 486. Nicol. 1802.

CANONS OF CANDID CRITICISM.—If you have a mind to depreciate a work of acknowledged excellence out of pique to the author, either becauſe he is a friend to ſocial order and legal government, or becauſe he has dared to chaſtiſe a man whoſe every word is a libel, and every action a crime, the following rules are recommended, as the moſt efficacious means to accompliſh the deſign.

First, beſtow every general abuſe poſſible on the conduct of the work, and of the character and perſon of the author; ſeaſoned with a plentiful ſprinkling of the groſſeſt epithets the Engliſh language affords.

Secondly, by way of ſhewing your candour, ſelect ſome quotations which you ſay have merit, though among the numerous faults of the work they are

Rari nantes in gurgite vaſta;

but be ſure they are ſome of the weakeſt parts of the poem: by which you will ſhew how ready you are to praiſe, and how deſerving a poem muſt be of cenſure, when ſuch are the only parts which ſo much candour can find

find worthy of approbation: and if in these quotations there should happen to be what *are*, or what you imagine to *be*, incorrect rhymes, or colloquial phrases, point them out to your readers by printing them in Italicks.

Thirdly, search with the eye of a lynx for all the passages, many of which must occur in a work of such length, and which it is beyond the power of human genius and human diligence to avoid; bring them all together before the reader, and assure him they are fair and just specimens of the execution of the whole.

And *fourthly*, if the author throughout his whole body of notes has shown a real regard for rational liberty, and an abhorrence for the tyranny of those monsters who wore the Roman purple, do not call him a republican or a democrat, for that would be considered as a high panegyrick by the generality of your readers, but boldly assert at once, without producing any proof, that he is a hireling of government, and a friend to despotism, which are of course synonimous terms.

All these modes are exemplified in the critique on Gifford's Juvenal, in the Critical Review. The Reviewer has not selected one passage of excellence; and in those passages he does cite as such, he points out in Italicks what he conceives to be vulgar expression, and (following the school of Gilbert Wakefield in correct rhymes) never recollecting that Juvenal, though very spirited and often sublime, is himself a coarse writer, and does not affect elegance of expression; and that there is not one rhyme objected to which may not be found in Pope, who certainly carried the versification of the English language to the greatest extent of refinement it could bear, without weakening its energy and loading it with the shackles which have degraded the verse of France from the rank of poetry; and whom even this critic allows, in his concluding sentence, to be "a distinguished master of the British lyre."

The reviewer is very witty on Mr. Gifford in this passage. "Mr. Gifford follows preceding translators" (every one, by the way, must follow those who precede them) "principally in faults. We exemplify by an amusing specimen; * * *.

"Lectus erat Codro Procula miror. Juv. iii. 203.

"Juvenal remarks only that 'the bed of Codrus was too short for Procula.' This translator, imitating Holyday, measures the lady also, and adds that Codrus had no other bed:

"Codrus had but one bed, and that too short
"For his short wife.

"Dryden is still more *delicately* sportive;

"Codrus had but one bed,—so short to boot,
"That his short wife's short legs hung dangling out."

Now it appears to us that Mr. Gifford here has exactly given the sense of Juvenal without running into the *delicate* sportiveness of Dryden. The passage might be a good joke to contemporaries, who knew the size of Procula, but required explanation to us; and to make the sense of a translation depend on reference to a note is like the sign painter who was obliged to write under his figure "this is the red lion," to explain what it was meant to represent. The one bed is plainly implied in the original.

Let us take a while a more pleasing task, and quote some of those passages which give this translation the merited epithet of excellent.

Can any lines be more spirited and yet more faithful to the original, than these in the tenth satire.

"The

" The ſpoils of War; the trunk in triumph placed,
And with the gleanings of the battle graced,
Cruſh'd helms, and batter'd ſhields; and ſtreamers borne
From vanquiſh'd fleets, and beams from chariots torn,
And captives rang'd around in mournful ſtate,
Are priz'd as bleſſings ſcarcely known to fate;
Fir'd with the love of theſe, what countleſs ſwarms,
Barbarians, Romans, Greeks, have ruſh'd to arms,
All danger ſlighted, and all toil defied,
And madly conquer'd, or as madly died!
So much the raging thirſt of fame exceeds
The generous warmth which prompts to worthy deeds,
That none confeſs fair Virtue's genuine power,
Or woo her to their breaſt, without a dower.
Yet has this wild deſire, in other days,
This boundleſs avarice of a few for praiſe,
This frantic rage for names to grace a tomb,
Involv'd their country in one general doom;
Vain rage! the roots of the wild fig-tree riſe,
Strike through the marble, and—their memory dies;
For, like their mouldering tenants, tombs decay,
And with the duſt they hide, are ſwept away."

Or than this concluding paſſage of the ſame ſection:

" O Thou, who ſee'ſt the wants of human kind,
Grant me all health of body, health of mind;
A ſoul prepar'd to meet the frowns of fate,
And look undaunted on a future ſtate;
That reckons death a bleſſing, yet can bear
Exiſtence nobly, with its weight of care;
That anger and deſire alike reſtrains,
And counts Alcides' toils and cruel pains,
Superior to the feaſts, the wanton ſport,
And morbid ſoftneſs of the Aſſyrian court.
" This, thou to give thyſelf may'ſt well ſuffice:—
The only path to peace through virtue lies.
O Fortune, Fortune! all thy boaſted powers
Would ſhrink to nothing, were but prudence ours:
But man, fond man, exalts thee to the ſpheres,
And clothes thee in the attributes he fears!"

We have ſelected theſe examples from the tenth Satire, becauſe an invidious compariſon is drawn by the reviewer between the imitation of Johnſon and the tranſlation of Gifford.

In the third Satire this ſplendidly ſevere paſſage in the original,

" Da teſtem Romæ———
ridiculos homines facit"——Sat. III. V. 137—153,

thus admirably tranſlated by Gifford, is, except the concluding ſentence, totally omitted by Johnſon.

" Produce at Rome your witneſs; let him boaſt
The ſanctity of Cybele's fam'd hoſt,
Of Numa, or of Him whoſe zeal divine
Snatch'd pale Minerva from her blazing ſhrine;
Firſt to explore his wealth the judges haſte,
His honour, and his honeſty, the laſt—

What

'What does his table coſt him; can you gueſs?
'What ſervants, what demeſnes does he poſſeſs?'
Theſe weighty matters known, his faith they rate,
And ſquare his probity to his eſtate.
The poor may ſwear by all the Immortal Powers,
By the great Samothracian gods, and ours,
Their oaths are falſe, they cry; the knaves deſpiſe
Almighty juſtice, and contemn the ſkies;
Almighty juſtice knows they lie for bread,
And bids its thunders ſpare each venial head!—
Add, that the wretch is ſtill the theme of ſcorn,
If the ſoil'd veſt be rent, or over-worn,
If the bare foot through the burſt ſhoe appear,
Or the coarſe botch betray ſome recent ſcar.
O Poverty! thy thouſand ills combin'd,
Sink not ſo deep into the generous mind,
As the contempt and laughter of mankind."

We have already mentioned Mr. G. Wakefield's faſtidious criticiſm on the rhymes of Pope: and throughout his notes on Pope's Homer he is laviſh of cenſure on this ſplendid work. To candour that gentleman has (or rather had) no pretenſion. In his general obſervations on Homer and his tranſlator, prefixed to the Odyſſey, he imputes every fault to Pope that a tranſlator can poſſibly be guilty of. But yet his concluding confeſſion is ſo different from the dark and rooted malignity of this anonymous critic, that we think we cannot end this article better than by an inſertion of it. "I muſt adverti ſe the reader that to notice imperfections was more conſonant to my duty than ſo expatiate on excellence. The numberleſs elegancies of Pope's tranſlation would in this caſe have reduced me to the neceſſity of perpetual exclamation only with no great deference to the taſte and ſagacity of the reader: Pulchrè, benè, rectè! muſt have been the wearifome and monſtrous burthen of every paragraph. The gay profuſion of poetic flowers through this Paradiſe of the Muſes, beams with a bloom of beauty and breathes with a gale of fragrance which muſt create vibrations of pleaſure on the dull ſenſorium even of the moſt inanimate obſerver, and will charm the more delicate ſenſations of ſympathetic ſouls with inexpreſſible and eternal rapture."

Letter to the Electors of Nottingham. By John Cartwright, Eſq. 8vo. Pp. 67. Printed by Wilſon and Co. Oriental Preſs. *No Publiſher's name.* 1803.

A Letter to Mr. Robert Davison, Worsted Spinner, Arnold. By Mr. Alexander Foxcroft, Attorney at Law, Nottingham; with the Reply of the former thereto. 8vo. Pp. 31. Nottingham printed; Jordan, London. 1803.

A Poſtſcript to Thoughts on the late General Election, as demonſtrative of the Progreſs of Jacobinism. 8vo. Pp. 27. Rivingtons. 1803.

WE have claſſed theſe three publications together (in the order in which they appeared) becauſe they relate to the ſame ſubject, and the ſame arguments will apply to them all. And we have placed them in this

this department of our work, in order to exhibit the conduct of the *Monthly Reviewers* in its proper light; since these gentlemen, whom for some time past we have purposely forborne to notice, seem once more disposed to throw off the mask, and openly to avow their real principles and sentiments, which, for a time, we made it their interest to conceal.

In our review of Mr. Davison's former pamphlets,* we proved, from his own words, that this spinner of worsted, who proclaimed himself to be a staunch whig, would, had he lived in the days of our first Charles, and had acted consistently with his principles, have been a *rebel* and a *regicide*. That he and all his Nottingham worthies who associated in the same cause, are true *whigs*, we are not permitted to doubt, since the fact has since been declared, in the House of Commons, by their champion Mr. Fox, who is a whig himself; and afterwards by the dissenting conductors of the Monthly Review, who assure their readers, that "Mr. Davison is a manly, clear-headed whig."† Thus, what we have said of Mr. Davison, clearly applies to the whole body of modern whigs, who, thinking, or professing to think, that Charles the First was a *tyrant* who, by his *tyranny*, was *justly* brought to the block, are evidently to be considered in the same light.—We have now the creed of modern whiggism explained, and happy are we that the worthy gentlemen have spoken out upon the subject. Before then, we proceed to notice the three pamphlets before us, we will just contrast the sentiments of these illustrious whigs with those of all true members of the Church of England, as explained in the Liturgy of that Church.

Horne Tooke, the bosom friend of *Sir Francis Burdett*, the gentleman who would go no farther on the road to Windsor, on a *patriotic* errand, than *Hounslow*, probably because the Heath beyond exhibits a most uncomfortable *memento mori* for patriots engaged in such a business; and a leading member of the *Whig Club*, declared, as our readers must recollect, on a memorable occasion, that had he lived in the reign of our first Charles, he would have been the first man to plunge a dagger into the heart of his sovereign. We cannot pretend to say whether the *Worsted Whig of Arnold* would have taken so active a part in that patriotic work of regicide, but he certainly would have applauded the *Wimbledon Hero* for his patriotism, as he has told us of "that tyranny which *justly* brought Charles to the block." And *Mr. Fox* and the *Monthly Reviewers*, having adopted this sentiment, would certainly have been either principals in, or accessaries to, the murder of their Prince. Now let us hear what the Liturgy, speaking the language of that Church, of which every *Member of Parliament* and every *Magistrate of Nottingham*, must, unless he be guilty of *perjury*, be a member, declares on the subject of that assassination. Prefixed to the prayers for the anniversary of what these whigs call the *just* execution of King Charles, is the following order of the Church: "A Form of Prayer with *Fasting*, to be used yearly upon the thirtieth of January, being the day of the MARTYRDOM of the *blessed* KING CHARLES I. to implore the mercy of God, that neither the *guilt* of that *sacred* and *innocent* blood, nor those other sins, by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our king into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited

---

* See ANTI-JACOBIN Review, Vol. XIV. p. 177, et seq.

† MONTHLY REVIEW for February last, p. 218.

upon

upon us or our poſterity." In the prayers appointed for this ſolemn day of national expiation and repentance we find the following expreſſions:—"O moſt mighty God, who didſt ſuffer the life of our gracious Sovereign King Charles the Firſt to be, as this day, taken away by the hands of *cruel* and *bloody* men; lay not the guilt of this *innocent blood*—to the charge of the people of this land." In another prayer he is called "our martyred Sovereign," who, by the grace of God, "was enabled ſo cheerfully to follow the ſteps of his bleſſed Maſter and Saviour, in a conſtant meek ſuffering of all his barbarous indignities, and at laſt reſiſting unto blood, and even then, according to the ſame pattern, praying for his *murderers*." We could make other quotations to the ſame effect, but theſe will ſuffice to put the Church at iſſue with the whigs, and poſſibly to induce the author to look, for once, into ſo old-faſhioned a book, as the *Prayer Book*.—So much for the loyalty of the whigs, including the patriotic recluſe of St. Anne's Hill, the worſted ſpinner of Arnold, and the Monthly Reviewers, who boldly aſſert that Mr. Daviſon "has defended his character and political principles with great ſpirit and ability"—certainly with the ſpirit of a *whig* and the ability of a *poiſſarde*. We ſhall now turn to another notable whig, John Cartwright, Eſq.

The *temper* of Mr. Cartwright's publications might be conjectured from this circumſtance alone; that he can find no bookſeller bold enough to publiſh them; hence the author is obliged to be his own publiſher. The object of the preſent pamphlet is to recommend Mr. Cartwright as a proper repreſentative for Nottingham, and to ſay the truth, if, as he contends, the Members of the Houſe of Commons be merely the truſtees of the perſons by whom they are elected, and if all the electors of Nottingham were ſuch "manly, clear-headed whigs" as Mr. R. Daviſon, the worſted-ſpinner, they could not chuſe a more ſuitable repreſentative than this *ci-devant* major.

The greater part of this ſtupid and prolix diſſertation is a ſenſeleſs jargon about *conſtitution* and *popular repreſentation*, ſcarcely intelligible, we ſhould think, to any but the ſages of the *London Correſponding Society*. Before he tells us what he *does* mean, he deems it expedient to tell us what he does *not* mean, (which appears to be much the eaſieſt part of the taſk) and alſo with whom he does *not* agree. He does not agree with *Mr. Reeves* in his definition of the conſtitution; this is natural, becauſe *Mr. Reeves* is a lawyer and underſtands the conſtitution, whereas he, Mr. C., evidently knows nothing about it. Nor yet does he agree with *Mr. Arthur Young*; nor with *Lord Grenville*; nor with *Mr. Windham*; nor with *Mr. Dundas*, nor with *Mr. Pitt*. Having adopted this train of argument, it might naturally be expected that having told us with whom he does *not* agree, he would next inform us with whom he *does* agree. But that would not have been perfectly conſiſtent with prudence. The deficiency, however, is eaſily ſupplied; for, as far as we can underſtand him, he agrees with *Thomas Paine*, with *Horne Tooke*, *Joel Barlow*, *Hardy the ſhoemaker*, *O'Coigley*, and Sir Francis Burdett's worthy friend, *Arthur O'Connor*. His diſſent from *Mr. Windham* he thus explains.

"With the learned advocate for bull-baiting, with the vindictive champion of 'a vigour beyond the law,' who 'deprecates even peace if reform be to follow,' and who 'locks up in military priſons an Engliſh ſoldiery, to wean them from the feelings, and to render them' deaf 'to the complaints of an injured Engliſh people' (of Deſpard and his aſſociates for inſtance)

ſtance) 'I cannot agree; for in truth I cannot behold the barrack-badges of my country's degradation from the dignity of freedom, I cannot witneſs this bayonet profanation of our ſacred conſtitution without ſhame and indignation."

It muſt be confeſſed, that a military defence is a terrible obſtacle to the aſſertion of the *ſacred right of inſurrection*, and that *barracks* are awkward impediments to that facility of communication which is neceſſary for giving full effect to *patriotic* admonitions. Mr. C. of courſe agrees with Mr. Daviſon in his opinion of the late adminiſtration, of whom, with equal regard to decency and truth, he aſſerts, that they were "men whoſe deſpotiſm in its cruelty rivalled the inquiſition; and whoſe miniſtry, to the indelible diſhonour of our age and nation, and for which every Engliſhman owes them perſonal reſentment, was diſgraced by the brutality of TORTURE." What he means by this he has not condeſcended to explain. He concludes his *tirade* by calling them, "tyrannical, unjuſt, and inhuman."

In explaining what he *does* mean by the conſtitution, Mr. C. aſſures us that the very ſoul of it is *repreſentation* and *political liberty*, which are "convertible terms;" they are indeed *convertible*, for of late years they have been converted, by whigs, into *anarchy and rebellion*. But the *liberty* which he means is not to be found, he tells us, in this country, at preſent; nor yet the *political repreſentation* to which he adverts; ſo that it follows, as a neceſſary inference from his premiſes, that the conſtitution no longer exiſts, in ſhort, that we have no ſuch thing as a conſtitution; and, indeed, all his arguments, like thoſe of that arch-rebel Thomas Paine, tend to eſtabliſh this fact. As far as we can collect his meaning from his declamation, he means to aſſert that there is no liberty in this country, without *univerſal ſuffrage* and *annual parliaments*, nor even then, unleſs the repreſentatives ſo choſen act as the mere delegates of their conſtituents, conſtantly ſubject to their orders and revocable at their pleaſure. One other condition too, he affirms, is indiſpenſably requiſite to the exiſtence of political liberty; that the people ſhould all bear arms, and that there ſhould be no *hireling* ſoldiers. And this he has the folly and the effrontery to maintain, is the real conſtitution of England! Were we to aſk him where we are to look for this conſtitution, he probably might refer us to the archives of the London Correſponding Society, or to the records of the Whig Club. Certainly not to the Statute Book, not to the laws of England, to which alone any rational man would refer for it. And this chimera of his own brain, which never did, which never can exiſt, in a MONARCHY, he calls on the people to adopt, urging them, in pretty plain terms, to employ both their hearts and their hands, in enforcing the adoption of it by the nation. "Taxation, without repreſentation" ſuch as prevails in England, he ſays, "even in the ſlighteſt degree, ought to create univerſal alarm, and beget *univerſal oppoſition*; but when experienced in an extreme—when amounting to a national calamity, as heavy as univerſal, every boſom ought to glow with a ſenſe of the common duty; every hand ought to bear its teſtimony againſt the wrong; every voice ought to be raiſed to demand redreſs."—And that there may be no *miſtake* as to his ſentiments on this ſubject, he reminds his ſovereign, that it was nothing but "taxation without repreſentation that coſt King Charles the Firſt his crown and his life;" and was one of the prominent features in "the deſpotic meaſures for which King James was *driven* from the throne." Now when we conſider the perfect uniformity of ſentiment between this writer, and his fellow-labourer, Mr. Robert

Robert Davison; when we find the latter declaring that King Charles *justly* lost his head on the block, and the former imputing his death solely to taxation without representation, such as he declares now prevails in this country, and which he says is "*to rule and to rob,*" warning his sovereign of the fate of that prince, calling upon his countrymen to resist the present system of government, telling them, "opposition is vain, redress must be given," and calling it "a system so degrading,—a system so flagitious,—a system which is no other than despotism and pillage combined, I trust in God the English nation will rather perish than endure;" there is but one inference that can be drawn from his arguments, both as to his motives and his object.

To remind such a *patriot,* that if every man had a vote, and no man was free who was not represented, in every contested election, the *minority* would be left in a state of *slavery,* because, they would have no delegate to speak their sentiments and to receive their orders;—that if a representative so chosen was subject to the directions of his constituents on every public question, the year for which he was elected would be devoted to the sole purpose of consulting them, and the public business could not possibly be transacted;—that if liberty consisted in having no *paid* troops, and every man bore arms; one of two things must follow, that either the whole body must act, and the necessary occupations of life be neglected; or a part only must act, and they be supplied with the means of subsistence by those who remained inactive; and then the whole system would fall to the ground, for the former would be as much *hirelings* as our present army.—To remind such a patriot as Mr. C., we say, of these *trifling* objections to his notable plan of *reform,* or, to speak more correctly, of *subversion,* would be a vain and fruitless task; for his self-confidence is as determined as his ignorance is incorrigible.

When Mr. Reeves asserted a plain fact respecting the parliamentary constitution of this country, a former House of Commons, to their eternal infamy be it recorded, determined that the father of the loyal associations should be prosecuted; but what will the present House of Commons say to a man who has the audacity to ask this question?—"*Can such a House of Commons possess the right of taxation?*" If the House do not possess this right, they have, indeed, been guilty of usurpation and robbery; but we suspect they will tell this furious whig a different story.—He proceeds, however, to state, that the question respecting the assertion of this right, on the part of the House, "is neither more nor less than whether the PROPERTY of the whole nation shall in future belong to its right owners, or through the well-paid agency of a reptile faction, to the crown. On the decision of this question must depend, whether we shall henceforth be a nation of free-men, or a herd of crouching slaves;—and slaves fleeced of their property to rivet their chains. And, can this reptile faction, can this crew of traffickers in voting stones, and invisible corporations, believe, that an intelligent, a proud, and high-spirited people, who, for attempting TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION, hurled from the throne their ancient kings, will endure Taxation without Representation from their mean and polluted hands! Shall it be endured, that a faction so contemptible, shall consider themselves as lords of all property, and as task-masters of the whole people; property to be given on demand in such proportions as *they* please; and the people, to toil for *their* profit, on the terms *they* shall impose! Shall this corrupt company of political traders,—shall these

theſe copartners in iniquity,—theſe buyers and ſellers of human liberty and human blood,—theſe babbling echoes of 'Peace, peace, peace; war, war, war;' without a motive but ſordid gain;—ſhall a faction of men ſuch as theſe, be ſuffered to ſurvey this fair land as *their own?*"

Of the *government* of this country he entertains the ſame exalted idea as of the Houſe of Commons. After ſtating that there can be no *liberty* where there is no *equal* repreſentation; and aſſerting that there is no ſuch repreſentation in England; he ſays, "by the ſecurity of *liberty* and *property*, or *the contrary*, it is preciſely determined, whether a government be GOOD or BAD; valuable or worthleſs; a bleſſing or a curſe. Where both liberty and property are *not* ſafe the government is vicious and oppreſſive." It is evident, therefore, that, in his eſtimation, the government of Great Britain is bad, worthleſs, a curſe, vicious and oppreſſive!!

But though he wiſhes to deſtroy the parliament and to reſiſt the government, he pays homage to the *people*. "I muſt not plead for a mere equality of claims on the part of the people, whoſe rights are inherent, original, and paramount; while peers, king, and conſtitution itſelf, all derived from them, are the mere creatures of *their* political creation." The *Liturgy* and the *Whig-Creed* are again at variance, for the former (which, we ſuppoſe, is no authority with Mr. Cartwright) teaches us to conſider our king as "the choſen ſervant," the "miniſter" of the Lord, and as having the "authority" of the Lord; not of the *people*. But, ſays Mr. C. "the only *underived* and abſolute ſovereignty, is the ſovereignty inherent in the people; none but the people can *change the conſtitution*,"—a pretty broad hint truly!—"A people *free* and not *ſovereign*, is a contradiction in terms." This execrable nonſenſe of the *ſovereignty* of *ſubjects*, were it not for the lamentable conſequences which it has already produced in France, and had it not a direct tendency to promote rebellion and regicide wherever it is promulgated, would be a ſubject of laughter and contempt.

After the ſpecimens which we have exhibited of Mr. Cartwright's principles there can be little difference of opinion reſpecting the ſpecies of *reform* which he is anxious to produce in this country; when he calls upon the people to exerciſe that voice which "has been already heard at *Nottingham* and at *Norwich*; in *Norfolk*, *Kent*, and *Middleſex*;" telling them, at the ſame time, that "the preſent decayed and perverted ſtate of our repreſentation, and the corrupt ſyſtem of government engrafted thereupon, MUST lead either to *ſettled deſpotism*, or to *civil war*, unleſs averted by REFORM." Yet, though ſpeaking ſo plainly, he does not heſitate to aſſert, "that the cauſe of reform has an advocate in THE HEIR TO THE THRONE, *we* have reaſon to know."—"So, for ſuch an alliance" (between the crown and the people) "ſo evidenced" (by an equal repreſentation through univerſal ſuffrage) "and ſo guaranteed" ("by the arms of a million of free men") "and at no diſtant period, we may confidently look." Were there the ſmalleſt foundation for this audacious aſſertion, what dreadful apprehenſions would it excite in the mind of every friend to the Britiſh monarchy. But it muſt be a groſs libel on the illuſtrious perſonage to whom the author alludes. The *Monthly Reviewers*, however, adopt all the ſentiments of this Nottinghamſhire patriot, and ſound forth his praiſes *con amore*. "Undauntedly"—ſay they, in their number for February—"he continues to maintain the neceſſity of a parliamentary reform. In a ſtrain of bold, nervous, and animated eloquence, he attacks that which is termed the borough-faction, and reprobates with indignation the deſpotic principle

of taxation without repreſentation. To *true whigs*, including we truſt the *sancta cohors comitum*" the whole corps of *Monthly Reviewers* we ſuppoſe, "many of Major Cartwright's periods will be highly reliſhing, while to thoſe of an oppoſite caſt they will be 'wormwood."——The murder of a King (Charles) and the ſovereignty of the people, are, no doubt, "*relishing*" morſels, *tit-bits*, for a herd of diſſenting critics. But we thank theſe gentlemen for once more *speaking out*; we are now at iſſue with them again; and will either drive them from the field, or be driven from it ourſelves.

Next in order are Mr. Foxcroft's letter to Mr. Daviſon, and the anſwer of the latter. The letter occupies but *three pages and a half*; the anſwer *twenty-four*. The former we ſhall extract, as being ſhort, and as explaining the ground of the diſpute.

"*To Mr. Robert Davison, Worsted Spinner, Arnold.*

"Sir,—The ſame regard which you profeſs to have for your own character, as being the cauſe of your late correſpondence with a gentleman of this town on the ſubject of an aſſertion which you have charged him with making to your prejudice, ought to have made you cautious that you did not fall into the culpable ſituation of which you complain.

"By a late publication of your letters, I obſerve you have in one of them aſſerted that the manner of acquiring the ſignatures to the petition of the burgeſſes lately preſented to the Houſe of Commons againſt the late election, will reflect an everlaſting diſgrace on thoſe concerned in it, and will be an eternal monument of their being ready to do any thing for emolument; and you ſay, the deceit and falſehood uſed in procuring the major part of thoſe ſignatures, and the coercion exerciſed to prevent the manly and ingenuous recantations of thoſe ſo impoſed upon, ſhall be fully expoſed at a proper ſeaſon.

"Now, Sir, your fiery temper cannot wait that ſeaſon, you knew I was the perſon profeſſionally employed to ſee the petition ſigned, and therefore muſt know, that you was charging me with deceit, falſehood, and fraud; wantonly, unprovokedly, and in a private correſpondence with which theſe petitions had no manner of connexion. You have trumpeted your charge in print to the public, to enable them to prejudge the caſe,—and as far as it was in your power, to injure my character; ſo that notwithſtanding all your boaſted liberality, you are feelingly alive for your own character, but can impudently trample upon another man's.

"I ſhould have hoped that the abuſe you have ſo liberally beſtowed on others, for what you are pleaſed to term *falſehood*, would have given you the hint not to have fallen into the ſame ſituation yourſelf—that you would not have attempted to bolſter up the proceedings at the late Election, but that you would have ſuffered them to ſtand or fall on their own merits or demerits at the approaching trial.

"However I may prize my own character, I ſhould have fairly reſted it with the public even upon the credit of your own aſſertions (for the man that can aſſert the late Election to have been the moſt peaceable of any conteſted one that is in remembrance in this town, will not gain much credit for veracity with an impartial public), but as my ſilence to theſe charges might be deemed an acquieſcence in their truth by ſome, and (what weighs more with me) might tend to injure the cauſe of my employer, I take the liberty of telling you thus publicly—that theſe aſſertions are *falſe*, *infamous*, and *ſcandalous*. In obtaining theſe petitions I deceived no man, I was guilty

guilty of no falsehood, I used no coercion, threats, or intimidation: but if you want to know who did—bridle your temper and wait a month, and that period will shew you who used all these to obtain a counter petition, by which wretched means only fifteen out of between five and six hundred were induced to say, that they did not mean to injure the Magistrates by signing Mr. Coke's petition, and several of those are now sorry that they ever signed such counter petition at all.

"I am no stranger to the violence of your temper, I tremble not at its fiercest blasts; I love my country and its constitution, and though poor, emolument was no cause for my engaging in holding up to public view the more than infamous proceeds at this *peaceable* Election; and the swarm of libels which have been since let loose upon the public, by wretches hired to distribute them almost every night, and by every secret means possible. If you are ambitious to appear as an author, and serious in your attack upon calumny, you may find ample subjects to employ yourself upon; for almost every good and virtuous character in this town has been vilely traduced: but the time is approaching when a general reckoning will be called, and I have no doubt but justice will be done to all---let you and I wait that time with patience.

"Be assured I wished not to have appeared in print, it is yourself, that by asserting a barefaced falsehood, has impelled me to it; I have put my assertion against yours---we are upon our country, and that country will soon be able to judge between us by the event I allude to.

I am yours, &c. ALEX. FOXCROFT.

"*Nottingham, 15th January*, 1803."

"P. S. At this moment three persons are going round the town, threatening the Burgesses who signed Mr. Coke's petition, that unless they sign a recantation they will be prosecuted:---I hope these men will be treated by every man of spirit with a H*******p."

By all the rules of argument, Mr. Davison having made an assertion which Mr. Foxcroft denies, the weight of proof lays upon the former. But instead of attempting to *prove* what he had advanced, the worsted spinner, whose tongue, if it be like his pen, must be more intolerable than the clack of his own mills, pours out a torrent of additional abuse and invective, heaps assertion upon assertion, and treats with equal contempt both reason and facts. He repeats his charge, but though he affirms that "of its truth" he possesses "confirmation strong as proofs of holy writ," he does not exhibit a single proof, but contents himself with ridiculously calling on Mr. F. to "prove" his "falshood." Prove a negative! Well done, worsted spinner, you improve in argument most wonderfully! This is the way in which Mr. R. D. shews his reverence for the cause "of truth, and genuine constitutional whiggism." He lays about him most lustily, and with as great an air of confidence, as if he were haranguing his apprentices in his own manufactory, or exhorting them in his own meeting-house, under the same roof. He accuses Mr. Coke of having signed a petition which he knew to contain falshoods against the late Mayor and Sheriff. A tolerable stretch of impudence. But he goes farther, and renews his assertion, that "the late election was the most peaceable of any contested one which is in remembrance at Nottingham." But gently, good Sir, you said something more than this in your former pamphlet. Your expretion to Mr. Maddocks was—"You know that Nottingham never beheld such a

concourſe of people aſſembled, nor did its inhabitants ever witneſs the termination of a conteſted election, with ſuch peace and order." So that ſuch peace and order never were known, in that moſt peaceable and orderly town, at any time, when ſuch a concourſe of people was aſſembled, not merely, at an election, but at a fair, or on any other public occaſion. And you here again aſſert, that "this is a *fact*, and acknowledged to be ſo too," even by the warm friends of Mr. Coke. But, fortunately for that cauſe of truth which you profeſs ſo ſtrongly to *revere*, though not quite ſo fortunately for the cauſe of "genuine, conſtitutional whiggiſm," you have *now* not only to contend with Meſſrs. Maddocks and Foxcroft, but with the Committee of the Houſe of Commons. Yes, Sir, that tribunal, to which you and your adverſaries appealed, has, at length, by the mouth of its chairman, given the lye direct to your aſſertion thus qualified, and thus renewed, by an unequivocal declaration, that the proceedings at Nottingham, during the election, amounted to *a gross violation of the freedom of election, by outrages, diſturbance, and perſonal violence; by repreſenting them as compelling a candidate, after repeated inſolence and violence, to leave the town which he ſought to repreſent, and to which he could not afterwards venture to return*, and as *involving the miſconduct of the magiſtrates, whoſe indiſpenſable duty it was to prevent ſuch proceedings!* Here then is the true character of the *peace and order* of the Nottingham whigs, eſtabliſhed by a deciſion from which you, Robert Daviſon, whig and worſted ſpinner, with all your confidence, dare not appeal! Alas! poor Robert, how art thou chop-fallen! Where are now thy gibes and jokes?

Mr. Daviſon having been charged with uſing undue influence, to make his workmen vote for the *whig* candidate, denies the aſſertion; and here brings forward *proofs* of his own diſintereſted conduct. One man whom he had given orders to diſmiſs he retained in his ſervice, *becauſe*, ſays he, "he polled againſt me." Did this worſted ſpinner never hear of a man deſtroying his own credit, or injuring his own cauſe, by *proving too much*. If he never ſaw a man of this deſcription, let him look in the glaſs. His other proof is a man who had told him that he was reſolved to give a ſingle vote to Mr. Birch. But Mr. D. very conſcientiouſly adviſed him not to give offence to his friends by ſo voting. The man, however, as Mr. D. probably foreſaw, and as, unqueſtionably, he had a right to expect, adhered firmly to his reſolution, and gave Mr. Birch *a plumper*. Theſe are very convincive proofs indeed. Mr. D. underſtands ſpinning, no doubt, better than writing, if he did not indeed, it muſt be a loſing concern to him; for a more miſerable compoſition than this letter, compoſed with the ability of a ploughman, and the temper of a Billingſgate, we have ſeldom peruſed; and, therefore, we give him the friendly advice, notwithſtanding the encouragement he has received from his diſſenting brethren, the Monthly Reviewers,* to

---

* "A Continuation of the Nottingham Election Controverſy, Parchment *verſus* Worſted Stockings; in which Parchment rattles moſt luſtily, but Worſted Stockings gives him ſuch a hard dry rub in reply, that he ſhrinks vanquiſhed from the field. Indeed, the Worſted-ſtocking conceals a two-edged ſword of no common keenneſs and temper, by which the parchment is cut to atoms, and made the ſport of the winds." M. R. for February, p. 219. We exhibit this as a ſpecimen of elegant criticiſm, and a ſample of whig honeſty.

ſtick

ſtick to his trade. Ne ſutor ultra crepidam—which we tranſlate, for the country whigs, eſpecially thoſe of Nottingham;—Spinner, ſtick to your Jenny.

We, at length, turn our eyes to a publication of a very different deſcription from the two we have reviewed; to one written by a gentleman who underſtands the conſtitution of his country, and who venerates it becauſe he underſtands it.

Mr. Bowles begins his Poſtſcript, by informing his readers, that having been called upon by a trio of Nottingham whigs, viz. John Daviſon, late mayor; (brother, we preſume, to the worſted ſpinner of Arnold) Thomas Oldknow and Joſeph Oldknow, aldermen; to retract his aſſertion reſpecting the Goddeſs of Reaſon, which "did not contain one ſyllable of truth," he felt it to be his duty, to inſtitute a farther inquiry into this ſtrange buſineſs, which, he tells us, "has had the effect, not only of *ſubſtantially* confirming, by evidence the moſt concluſive, his general ſtatement, but of bringing to light ſome additional circumſtances, which, he is ſorry to ſay, prove that ſtatement to have been ſhort of the truth." So much for the veracity of theſe Nottingham patriots, and particularly of Mr. Robert Daviſon, the worſted ſpinner, who had, with a boldneſs peculiar to himſelf, roundly aſſerted—"*It is falſe*, that any tree or bough, denominated the tree of liberty, was carried in the proceſſion.—*It is falſe*, that any revolutionary airs were ſung or played.—*It is falſe* that any expreſſion was uſed during the proceſſion, which indicated the ſmalleſt diſreſpect, much leſs a total abhorrence of kings." In oppoſition to this direct denial, Mr. Bowles, after due and deliberate enquiry, ſolemnly affirms—

"It is now an hiſtorical fact, that in a populous town, in the very heart of Great Britain, amidſt thouſands and tens of thouſands of ſpectators, a ſcene has taken place, the very deſcription of which tranſports the mind inſtantaneouſly to the worſt periods of the French revolution; a ſcene in which a tree of liberty,† a republican tri-coloured ſtandard, and French national cockades, were publicly exhibited—in which Revolutionary airs were played and ſung—in which a Goddeſs of Reaſon walked in ſolemn proceſſion; and which was crowned by a well known ceremony at Nottingham, that of planting the Tree of Liberty, around which the Jacobinical mob exultingly danced, vociferating, 'We'll down with all Kings, and Millions be free.' Nor was this all. The French revolutionary character of the proceſſion was not left to depend upon mere ſymbols, however characteriſtic and unequivocal. The day on which the proceſſion took place, happened to be the 14th of July; a day rendered memorable by the deſtruction of the Baſtile, and made the epoch from which the French revolution took its date. This circumſtance was not forgotten. The mob were expreſsly reminded of the day, the deſtruction of the Baſtile was mentioned to them as a cauſe for joy and exultation. That day and that event were deſcanted upon with *unqualified* praiſe. No lamentation was uttered on account of the ſanguinary ferocity, by which the people of Paris diſ-

---

"† It has been inſinuated that what has been called a tree of liberty was only the bough of a Birch tree, procured in honour of the ſucceſsful candidate. It muſt be left to the initiated in Revolutionary myſteries to decide whether a Birch tree may not make as good a tree of liberty as any tree of the foreſt."

graced human nature on that occaſion. No regret was expreſſed for the atrocious murder of De Launay and Fleſſelles, who then fell victims to the moſt ſavage barbarity which a civilized people had ever diſplayed; no complaint was uttered for the numberleſs crimes, the horrors, the maſſacres, which, during the years of anarchy that are computed from the above day, have rendered France an Aceldama and a charnel houſe. All this was paſſed over in profound ſilence; and the day which is rendered for ever infamous by ſuch tranſactions, and ſuch conſequences, was announced, as if it had ſhed a luſtre and beſtowed a dignity on *that* which was then paſſing; and had rendered the caſual coincidence, in the calendar, between the triumph at Paris over legitimate government, and that at Nottingham over the rights of election, a ſubject of congratulation."

Mr. B. obſerves, that "after the evidence which has really been adduced before a Committee of the Houſe of Commons, an unqualified denial of the exhibition of a French proceſſion at Nottingham will ſcarcely be made." But he thinks it probable that attempts will be made "to ſoften down proceedings" which can no longer be denied. Adverting to the proceedings before the Committee of the Houſe, he remarks, that to eſtabliſh the facts of the proceſſion formed no part of the Petitioner's caſe, though Capt. Johnſon's evidence "ſtamped it indelibly with a gallic revolutionary character;" but, if it had, abundant proofs of all the facts advanced by him would have been produced.

"Many reſpectable perſons, in and about Nottingham, were eye-witneſſes of the facts alluded to; though many more withdrew, in grief and in terror, from ſo ſhocking a ſpectacle. Nay, the very female who perſonated the Goddeſs of Reaſon, has ſince acknowledged that ſhe appeared in the above character; and one of the forty-two women who followed her has vouched the ſame fact, with the additional circumſtances that the perſon of the former was moſt indecently expoſed, and that ſhe was in a ſtate of intoxication. In ſhort, the moſt abundant proof of the deſcription of the proceſſion, which is contained in page 3 of this work, is ready to be produced, if thoſe, who have threatened the Author with a proſecution for his charges againſt the *loyal* town of Nottingham, will realize their threats. For this mode of intimidation has been attempted, in order to obtain from him an abandonment of his charges. He does not, indeed, claim any extraordinary degree of hardihood, for not having been intimidated by menaces, which he conſidered merely as *brutum fulmen*, and which, after the ſevere and juſt chaſtiſement that the Corporation of Nottingham has undergone, and is likely ſtill further to undergo, cannot be expected any longer to fulminate. But, although he may not have an opportunity afforded him of ſubſtantiating his charges, by the forms of legal teſtimony, he relies with the utmoſt confidence on the validity of the ancient maxim, *magna eſt veritas et prævalebit*; a maxim which involves the order, the virtue, and the ſafety of civil ſociety; and he doubts not, that the beams of truth will ſhine with increaſing refulgence, until they diſperſe the thick and baleful miſts of diſaffection and falſehood, by which in this, as in many other inſtances, they have been for a while obſcured.

"It has been already noticed (ſee page 3.) that the deſcription of entire nudity, which was applied by the author to the Goddeſs of Reaſon, originated in the expreſſion—"*à la nude*;" by which the appearance of the woman, who perſonated the above character, was immediately deſcribed by a reſpectable eye-witneſs of the proceſſion, and by which her appearance

was

was diſtinguiſhed from that of the women who followed her, and whoſe perſons were ſtated, by the ſame eye-witneſs, to have been moſt indecently expoſed. In juſtification of the uſe of ſo remarkable an expreſſion, one of the laſt-mentioned women has ſince declared, that the one who preceded, and who was called the Goddeſs of Reaſon, was dreſſed in *buff colour*. Unleſs for the purpoſe of conveying an idea of nudity, why was this woman attired differently from the reſt? Why was ſhe not, like the others, dreſſed in white? It would have been well, indeed, if her dreſs had conſtituted the worſt part of her appearance; but that part of her perſon, which was moſt conſpicuous in a crowd, was quite uncovered; a circumſtance well calculated to favour the ſuppoſition, that the reſt, attired as it was, was intended to exhibit a repreſentation of nudity."

We, who have long known the "temper and ſpirit" of the Nottingham whigs, are not ſurpriſed at theſe moſt infamous proceedings; we are only ſurpriſed at the anxiety diſplayed to diſavow thoſe principles, and thoſe actions which have ſo long conſtituted the theme of their exultation. It is paltry, pitiful hypocriſy, unworthy ſuch illuſtrious candidates for *patriotic* fame. Mr. Bowles, however, reflecting, no doubt, on the old adage, *nemo repente fuit turpiſſimus*, has directed his inquiry into the origin and progreſs of theſe revolutionary ſymptoms,

"It is natural to enquire, whether ſo malignant and deleterious a diſeaſe has ſuddenly burſt forth in the very heart of the kingdom, or whether it had previouſly diſplayed itſelf by any congenial ſymptoms. To this enquiry the hiſtory of Nottingham, for a conſiderable time back, furniſhes a melancholy reply. In that town a ſpirit of riot, outrage, diſaffection, and impiety, has, for ſome years, and particularly ſince the French revolution, diſplayed itſelf, to the terror and annoyance of the peaceful and loyal part of the inhabitants; moſt of the public houſes in that town, of which there are about 140, have been ſeminaries of diſloyalty and jacobiniſm, where the maxims of revolutionary France have been inculcated into the young and the unwary, and whence clubs of jacobins have been accuſtomed to iſſue, at the dead of night, roaring through the ſtreets the republican ſongs, which had been learned and practiſed at their abominable orgies. The conſtables have been, in general, diſaffected characters, and of courſe, unwilling to exert themſelves in ſuppreſſing jacobinical tumults; and ſome time ſince ten *loyal men*, in that important ſtation, were diſmiſſed in one day, for no other apparent reaſon than becauſe they were *loyal*. In the year 1796, the jacobinical mob trampled upon a flag, on which was inſcribed the motto "King and Conſtitution." The ſame mob have repeatedly inſulted the volunteers, both cavalry and infantry, in the groſſeſt manner, and have thereby, and by threats of private injury, induced many of theſe valuable, but unprotected men, reſiding in the out-parts of the town, to reſign. The buſineſs of the aſſizes has been repeatedly interrupted by riot and outrage, and even the Judges have been perſonally inſulted. But ſcenes, alas! ſtill more ſhocking than any of theſe remain to be deſcribed. In the year 1801, an election of a Churchwarden took place, a poll-booth was erected in the Church, and there the mob fully diſplayed their jacobinical and impious character. They not only wore their hats in the Church, but obliged others, who had more decency, to be covered, and they played at foot-ball with the hats of thoſe who came to vote againſt their favourite candidate; they even tore their clothes from the backs of many perſons of the latter deſcription, and thereby, and by other acts of violence, put an end to all oppoſition; and

meeting with no reſiſtance, either from Magiſtrates or Conſtables, carried the election, as they have lately done upon another occaſion, by *terror*. [Even ſome of the Magiſtrates, when prevailed upon at length to appear, walked about in the Church with their hats on. One of the mob ſat on an elevated ſeat, during four or five hours, holding a ſmall loaf, ſuſpended by a ſtring, and wrapped round with black crape, and repeatedly called out, that *the Church being made ſo fine, was the cauſe that the loaves were ſo ſmall.* Several pie-men came into the Church, and there diſpoſed of their pies and buns, for which they gambled with the mob, by toſſing up money for them. The mob were heard to declare, that they would ſoon get the better of the Church People, and make them pay to the Meetings; nay, that they would even pull down the Church. Some of the mob were heard to aſk, what the Font was for? and being told, they ſaid, let us fetch a dog and baptize him. This, however, was not all; they wantonly dirted the newly lined pews, and otherwiſe *indecently* as well as impiouſly, defiled the holy place in which they were aſſembled.

" In the ſame year the jacobinical mob took occaſion, from the ſacred ſolemnity of a confirmation, to inſult, not only the Church, to which they are taught to be decidedly hoſtile, but even Religion itſelf, in a manner almoſt too groſs to bear a deſcription. During the ſacred ſervice they filled the cemetery, got up to the windows of the Church, attempted to force open its doors, and by their hootings and yellings, did all they could to diſturb the ſolemn ceremony: they behaved with the greateſt indecency to the young women who came from being confirmed, and even aſſaulted their perſons, inſomuch that many of them fainted, and it was with the utmoſt difficulty that they could be conducted to the County-hall, though diſtant only ſixty yards from the Church. From the conſtables, the peace officers of their King, theſe young women received no protection! and at length it became neceſſary to call in ſome dragoons to diſperſe the mob.

" The occurrence of ſuch ſcenes as theſe is a ſtill more awful ſymptom, than even the diſgraceful and jacobinical proceedings, which occurred at and after the late election. Of all the ſentiments of which the human heart is ſuſceptible, that which ought to be cultivated with the greateſt care, and cheriſhed with the moſt conſtant attention, is a profound reverence for the Sovereign of the Univerſe; for that great and gracious Being, to whom we are indebted for our exiſtence, on whom we inceſſantly depend for our preſervation, and to whom we muſt one day render an account of the whole conduct of our lives. This ſentiment is the firſt principle of Religion, and of courſe it is indiſpenſable to the very exiſtence of civil ſociety, which, without Religion, never was, and never can be maintained. This ſentiment is always the laſt to be extinguiſhed in vitiated minds; it ſurvives all the inferior ſentiments which incite to the performance of moral duties; and its extinction is juſtly conſidered as the laſt ſtage of depravity and profligacy. What then muſt be the atrocity of that guilt, what the wickedneſs and miſchief of that heart, which can openly inſult the univerſal Creator, Governor, and Judge! It ſeems, indeed, impoſſible that any human heart can be guilty of ſuch daring impiety. It ſeems impoſſible for any rational being to be capable of ſuch inconceivable infatuation, as thus to outrage and defy a Power, to the gracious forbearance of which he muſt be indebted for a momentary delay of that vengeance, the immediate infliction of which would plunge him at once into everlaſting and inexpreſſible miſery. Such wickedneſs, and ſuch infatuation have, however,

however, been openly diſplayed, under the countenance of Magiſtracy, at Nottingham, where the Moſt High has been inſulted in the very Temples dedicated to His ſervice; where His Houſe has been moſt ſacriligiouſly profaned and defiled: where His worſhippers have been treated with violence and outrage, *because* they were engaged in one of the moſt ſolemn ceremonies of Religion!"

And are men who can be guilty of ſuch abominations worthy to be intruſted with the Elective Franchiſe? Let juſtice and common ſenſe anſwer. But, alas! appeals from the deciſions of juſtice and common ſenſe to *philanthropic* tribunals of *Liberality* and *Candour* are too prevalent and too ſucceſsful, in theſe times, to juſtify a hope of obtaining a fair and final verdict from *them*.

"The main ſource," ſays Mr. B. "of the depraved and diſorderly ſtate of this town, is a cuſtom which has there obtained (and which it is to be feared, is not peculiar to Nottingham) of excluding from the Corporation the only perſons who are entitled to be admitted into it. For, in defiance of the Laws and Conſtitution, to be a Member of the Church of England, which, legally and conſtitutionally, is a neceſſary qualification, operates, at Nottingham, as a diſqualification for the Offices of Magiſtracy: inſomuch, that thoſe offices are altogether in the hands of perſons who diſſent from the Eſtabliſhed Church, and who take care to exclude from their body all whoſe religious and political ſentiments do not accord with their own. A ſpirit of oppoſition, ripened by ſucceſs into actual animoſity againſt our religious eſtabliſhment, has naturally produced a diſpoſition equally unfavourable to our civil eſtabliſhment; and the virulence of this double hoſtility to Church and State has been viſibly progreſſive, during the period of a Revolution, which founded a general attack upon all eſtabliſhments, religious and civil. During that period, a cuſtom which had before prevailed on the part of the Corporation, of attending Divine Service once a year at each of the pariſh churches in the town of Nottingham, and of making a donation of 20*l.* to each of the three rectors, has been diſcontinued. During that period, the outrageous, and, in this country, unexampled profanation of a ſacred edifice, which have been here recited, took place; and, during that period, the tree of liberty, and all the other ſymbols of jacobiniſm have been introduced, and publicly exhibited."

This is one of the *happy* reſults of that *anomaly in legislation*, an annual indemnity bill, which certainly operates as a direct encouragement to a breach of the laws, and in fact to render thoſe laws nugatory and of no effect! What with acts of *indemnity* and acts of *toleration*, nothing ſhort of divine protection can prevent the eſtabliſhed church from being ſubdued by the conventicle. We cannot but think the ſufferance of ſuch abuſes a proof of criminal neglect in thoſe who have the means, and whoſe duty it is, to correct them. As a proof of the incorrigible diſpoſition of the corporation of Nottingham, even while the rod is hanging over them, "the public papers of that town announce, that *Good Friday* is the day ſelected for convening a Common Hall, for the purpoſe of making burgeſſes!"—Such an open and daring contempt of religion is a diſgrace to a *Chriſtian* country.

Mr. Bowles concludes with ſome juſt reflections on the Middleſex election, and on the delay which has taken place in deciding on the merits of the petitioning candidate. We here tread upon tender ground. But the ſubject is important and we will fairly declare our opinion upon it. It is, then, our decided conviction, that a *law* ſhould paſs to compel the members

bers of the Houſe of Commons to decide on the merits of every petition for undue returns, in the firſt ſeſſion, and before any prorogation of the Houſe. For where the petitions are numerous, a man who, by the perjury of a returning officer, or by his own profligate arts—we allude to no *existing*, but merely to a *possible* caſe—may retain his ſeat for two years, though he have no more right to it than his footboy. And during this period, the people will not only not be *represented*, but groſsly *misrepresented*; while ſome of their lawful repreſentatives are deprived of their privileges, and put to an enormous expence; to ſay nothing of minor inconveniencies favourable to the cauſe of uſurpation and injuſtice.—This is a conſideration of great *conſtitutional* importance, and we truſt, therefore, that it will attract the ſerious attention of the legiſlature.

Dr. Darwin and the Monthly Magazine.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

THE biographer of Dr. Darwin, in the Monthly Magazine, gives the following account of his religion, or rather of his *no* religion.

"There are reaſons for ſuſpecting that Dr. Darwin was not a believer in divine revelation: but belief is a matter of neceſſity, not of choice.—The religion of a man is a private affair between himſelf and his Maker: we have nothing to do with it. A few days before his death, a gentleman to whom we are indebted for the materials of a conſiderable portion of theſe memoirs, endeavoured to diſcover whether he entertained a belief and expectation of a future ſtate of exiſtence: the doctor was obſerved to ſpeak with a conſiderable degree of ſedateneſs on the ſubject; and remarked that it was natural to extend our wiſhes and views beyond the preſent ſcene, and that it was right to purſue ſuch meaſures as are likely to ſecure our happineſs in another world, but he added "let us not hear any thing about Hell." June 1802, p. 46.

A very few remarks will ſuffice. We are told that "belief is a matter of neceſſity, not of choice." The neceſſity of the philoſopher and the predeſtination of the Calviniſt are equally abominable, are equally made to ſerve the purpoſes of vice, to blind the judgment, and to ſtupify the conſcience. I maintain that belief is a matter of choice; and the grand reaſon that men do not believe is, that their will is wrong, the choice is perverſe; *they love darkneſs rather than light:* they do not want evidence, but inclination: their heads would ſoon admit the light of truth, could their hearts but give up the love of ſin. This is the ſecret charm, the grand hold of infidelity. This is the citadel which will not ſurrender. Faith then is more a matter of choice than any other part of man's conduct; but if men's deeds are evil, they will love darkneſs rather than light.

We are told, with equal modeſty and truth, that "a man's religion is a *private affair between him and his Maker*; with which we have nothing to do." With the gentlemen of this ſchool it is very doubtful whether we have a Maker; but ſuppoſing it for the argument's ſake, have we nothing to do with a man's religion? Did not He who formed ſociety, form religion alſo? Is not the public profeſſion of religion a debt due to ſocial beings?

beings? Is not the profeſſion required, and is it not one of the ſtrongeſt ties and ſafeguards of ſociety? Every man may be legally called upon to take an oath, but what will this oath prove if I know the man has no religion; if I know that he doubts or denies the being of a GOD: his oath will be no more reſtraint upon him than a whiſp of burnt ſtraw. Have we nothing to do with a man's character? and religion is a leading feature of the character. You would not truſt a lawyer with your property, unleſs you had an opinion of his legal ſkill; nor a phyſician with the care of your health, unleſs you had an opinion of his medical ſkill. In every tranſaction of buſineſs you inquire into a man's character and act accordingly: would you not do the ſame in his religious and moral character? therefore *we have ſomething to do with it.*

Dr. Darwin had no objection to hear about a future ſtate; probably he meant no more than the fame of his writings after his deceaſe; or he might have ſome ſecret miſgivings, ſome unſubdued fears, as ſhould there be another world; ſhould there be a place of puniſhment; have I any thing to apprehend for myſelf? have I made a due and wiſe preparation for that world ſhould it chance to exiſt? has my *moral* conduct, my regard to marriage as a *civil contract* been ſuch as to entitle me to reward, and to ſecure my happineſs ſhould I chance to live beyond the grave—*Let me not hear any thing about hell*; but why not, good doctor; if your faith was a matter of neceſſity, why not your actions too? Shall any man then be puniſhed for what he cannot help? But why does a philoſopher trouble himſelf with theſe things: hell may affright children and old women, but a *philoſophical* mind ſhould be above theſe things.

I believe there are but few *confirmed* infidels. Men may boaſt as if they were; but there are moments of ſolitude and reflection, there are ſome ſecret miſgivings; ſome whiſpers of conſcience which will be heard, ſome lingering, longing hope of immortality, which will ſpeak out. Man is naturally a religious being: he almoſt involuntarily thanks GOD for his bleſſings: he flies to him for comfort in affliction. The man then who confirms himſelf in atheiſm muſt do violence to his own nature: he blunts the beſt feelings and beſt expectations of a rational being. He muſt retain the human form in his body, while he loſes it as far as he poſſibly can in his mind.

OBSERVATOR.

ANTINOMIANISM OF THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

THE Chriſtian Obſerver when commenting on the Biſhop of Durham's Charge, and where his Lordſhip cautions his clergy againſt Antinomianiſm, inſerts this apology. "We cannot forbear expreſſing a hope that good people may have ſometimes miſunderſtood one another, when diſcuſſing this ſubject, and that the uſe of phraſes ill defined and of indeterminate expreſſions have a tendency to widen the breach, and to animate the ſpirit of controverſy." P. 30. Latet Anguis in herba.—Let us examine the meaning of theſe gentle expreſſions. The Chriſtian Obſerver cannot deny that there are Antinomians in the world; does he mean theſe by his *good people?* if not, the remark does not apply.

The author knows as well as the writer of this, that there are thoſe who boaſt

boaſt of free redeeming grace, of ſovereign mercy, who degrade and vilify the moral law; who treat it as a beggarly element; an intolerable yoke, a *brutum fulmen* to the elect; a man of ſtraw to frighten children and to be deſpiſed by men.

As a full proof I could refer to a hundred quotations from Dr. Criſpe's Chriſt Exalted; a book moſt ſtrongly recommended by moſt of the Calviniſtic divines, as containing the very marrow of the Goſpel; to various paſſages in the writings of the late Mr. Romaine, who was eſteemed as an oracle by a particular party. As for living authors or preachers, I will not name any, but quote ſome of their favourite expreſſions:—"The believer has no more to do with the law than the man in the moon." The believer has nothing to do with repentance, ſelf-denial and ſelf-examination; they are all legal works. He does not work *for* life, but *from* life. "The believer has three great enemies, Sin, the Devil, and Moſes; but that raſcal old Moſes" (or, the law of the LORD, which is holy, juſt, and good) "is the greateſt enemy of all."*

So much for the expreſſions of thoſe whom I call *Antinomians*, though the Chriſtian Obſerver calls them *good people* ſometimes *miſunderſtood*; but I aſk is there any ſenſe in language? Why then keep up a deluſion by ſpeaking ſmooth things, by prophecying deceits. What ſaith the ſcripture? "The LAW of the Lord is an undefiled law converting the ſoul. Whoſoever ſhall break one of the leaſt COMMANDMENTS, and ſhall teach men ſo, he ſhall be called the leaſt in the kingdom of Heaven." But with the Antinomian to ſlight and break the law is one of the high privileges of the children of God.

Bad principles lead to bad practices. Let us then now obſerve the *moral* tendency of theſe principles. Man as a fallen being, as placed in a world of temptations, requires every reſtraint to keep him from ſin, and every motive to excite him to goodneſs and to preſerve him in holineſs: what then is to be expected from principles which ſing a ſweet lullaby to the ſleeping conſcience; which ſuppreſs all rational fear, and juſt apprehenſions; which combine a life of ſinful indulgence with the aſſured favour of Heaven; which diſcard repentance, humiliation, ſelf-denial and amendment, as weak and beggarly elements; as childiſh fears, and legal workings: which pretend to exalt the goſpel of free grace by deſtroying holineſs of life? Some upright men will make a good uſe even of bad principles: they do not uſe the liberty, or rather licentiouſneſs, which is

---

* In a church near the Royal Exchange I once heard the lecturer, a regularly bred young man of the Univerſity of Oxford, commenting on theſe words—"Baptiſm doth now ſave us; not the waſhing of water, but the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God." He triumphantly aſked, who ever had the anſwer of a good conſcience? he anſwered that no one ever had or ever could have; therefore, that the only meaning of St. Peter in this text was the "imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt; this was the believer's anſwer of a good conſcience; this would ſatisfy all demands, and make his conſcience eaſy." Some may ſuppoſe that I was miſtaken; but like moſt extemporary preachers, the ſame ideas are repeated again and again: a little ſenſe is to fill up a long ſpace, an hour or more: abundance of ſound muſt often conceal deficiency of ſenſe.

given;

given; their judgments may be miſtaken, but their affections are not perverted. But this is not the caſe with all: ſome are Antinomians in life as well as in theory. They confirm themſelves in evil practices on their own principles. A decent exterior is preſerved: a certain reſpect muſt be paid to the world, but many deſtructive vices are practiſed in ſecret, and even juſtified on principle. Do not ſeveral high Calviniſts live in known adultery, and if a friend argue with them on the ſcandal of ſuch a conduct, do they not reject the advice as proceeding from one who is ignorant of the perfect law of liberty? Are theſe then to be called "*good men*," who *are ſometimes miſunderſtood*; are theſe "*phraſes ill defined*," and "*the expreſſions indeterminate?*" Can any caſe be clearer? They reject the Law of God as a rule of life: by their traditions they make void the law. This deluſion is moſt fatal to man; moſt diſgraceful to the Goſpel.

CLERICUS.

MISCELLANEOUS.

DEFENCE OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AGAINST THE ATTACKS OF THE LATE DR. CAMPBELL.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR, *Edinburgh, April 6*, 1803.

AS your excellent miſcellany was originally intended to propagate good principles through the nation, both religious and political, and has accordingly been frequently employed in defence of the Church of England and our moſt excellent Conſtitution, I therefore cannot doubt, but that as the Epiſcopal Church of Scotland, though poor and unfortunate, is a pure part of Chriſt's flock, you will have the goodneſs to indulge me with a few pages to repel a very rude attack upon my venerable mother, by one of the ableſt adverſaries that ever engaged in any controverſy. An attack, rude indeed, almoſt beyond imagination; and, (what will aſtoniſh you, when you hear that it was made by no leſs a man than the late Rev. Dr. George Campbell, Profeſſor of Divinity in, and principal of, the Mariſhal College of Aberdeen) weak, beyond conception! a man of uncommon acuteneſs and ability, and of great learning; generally believed alſo, to be extremely good-natured, moderate in his opinions, and liberal in his ſentiments! I am ſorry, however, to obſerve that, in the Eccleſiaſtical Lectures, which he framed for the inſtruction of his pupils, he appears quite the reverſe of all this; at leaſt, when ſpeaking of the poor remains of the Scottiſh Epiſcopalians, friends to peace, order, and good government, and to pure and undefiled religion: A Church too, whoſe faith, worſhip, and form of government, have repeatedly been proved to be conformable to the pure and primitive Church of Chriſt. I ſay, that in ſpeaking of this Church, the Doctor appears to be neither moderate in his opinions, nor liberal in his ſentiments; nor to write like a learned, or an able man. For in reſentment of ſome remarks made more than *thirty* years ago, upon a ſermon of his preached before the Synod of Aberdeen, in which he *ridiculed* the notion

of

of deriving a divine commiſſion for preaching the goſpel, *through the Apoſtles:* in reſentment, I ſay, of thoſe remarks, which, by the way, did great juſtice to his learning and abilities, and treated him with much civility and reſpect, hath this *good-natured Profeſſor,* ſpoken of our ſtill venerable, and, I truſt, not yet contemptible ſociety, in the moſt vilifying language his tongue could utter, or his pen write. He denies that the Scottiſh Epiſcopal Clergy have even "*proper Preſbyterial Ordination*;" or any orders but what they derive from *Biſhops* "*merely nominal,*" and he impiouſly calls the conſecrations of our poſt-revolution Biſhops, "*farcical conſecrations,*" ludicrouſly adding that, "they were ſolemnly made depoſitories of no depoſit, commanded to be diligent in doing *no work,* vigilant in the overſight of *no flock*; aſſiduous in teaching and governing *no people,* and preſiding in *no church.*" Nay, although he acknowledges that theſe, our before mentioned Biſhops (who "came under the hands of Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh," and he ſhould in juſtice have added, becauſe he knew it to be a truth, under the hands of Archbiſhop Paterſon of Glaſgow, and Biſhop Douglaſs of Dunblane alſo), "were regularly admitted miniſters or preſbyters in particular congregations before the revolution," yet he goes on, "let no true ſon of our Church be offended that I acknowledge our nonjurors to have a SORT of preſbyterian ordination, for I would by no means be underſtood as equalizing *theirs* to that which obtains with *us.* Whoever is ordained among us, is ordained a *Biſhop,* by a *Claſs of Biſhops:* Whereas the ordination of our nonjurors, proceeds from preſbyters to whom a *part* only of the miniſterial power was committed, and from whom was *withheld* the right of tranſmitting orders to others." He afterwards ſtiles our Scottiſh preſbyters "a ſort of *ſubordinate* miniſters, who are not *authorized to ordain,* and who on Hammond's hypotheſis, as well as ours, were not originally in the church." Vol. I. PP. 354, 5, 6, 7.

Such ſcurrilous abuſe as this, is, certainly, beneath notice, and the little argument that is in it, unworthy of an anſwer, nor ſhould it have received one from me, were it not for the celebrity of the Doctor's name, which, with ſome people, would ſtamp a value even upon nonſenſe; and did it not at the ſame time afford an opportunity of defending Epiſcopacy after a new mode, viz. by arguing on the learned Lecturer's and his brethren's own principles, and conſequently of effectually expoſing the weakneſs of the Preſbyterian cauſe, beyond the poſſibility of a reply. For theſe reaſons I ſay, I have once more taken up the pen againſt my old and long eſteemed acquaintance Dr. Campbell, and cannot but regret that, by language and reaſoning ſo unworthy of himſelf, he has obliged me more than to doubt, even to *believe,* that what he has written of the Scottiſh Church, is not the effect of *conviction,* but every word of it in contradiction to the dictates of his own mind. This cenſure, though ſevere, cannot fairly be conſidered as uncharitable, becauſe the juſtice of it is as viſible as light at noon day. For is it poſſible, that one of Dr. Campbell's abilities, who derived his own orders from *preſbyters,* could believe, that the Scottiſh Epiſcopal Clergy, have not *proper preſbyterial ordination,* when he acknowledges that the gentlemen who ordained them, were "regularly admitted *preſbyters* in particular congregations before the Revolution?" Surely not. Or ſince he knew that Meſſ. Sage and Fullarton, the Scottiſh Preſbyters he alluded to, "came under the hands;" that is, were conſecrated by three lawful Biſhops, Archbiſhop Paterſon of Glaſgow, Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh, and Biſhop Douglas of Dunblane, is it poſſible he could *believe* that they were only *nominal,* and not

real

real Biſhops? No; for, had the conſecration been performed in England, he would not have called their epiſcopal authority into queſtion; nor have preſumed to ſpeak ſo rudely of Lord Biſhops. But did it make any odds that the ceremony was celebrated on this ſide the Tweed, and by Biſhops who had been irregularly deprived of their temporal honour? Moſt certainly it did not. It was performed in a place of worſhip in Edinburgh, and probably in the chapel of Biſhop Roſe: a gentleman, of ſuch piety and gravity, that to ſuppoſe a conſecration *farcical*, in which he was concerned, was moſt indecent and uncivil. Indeed, the cauſe of our learned Lecturer's ridicule, is as ſenſeleſs, as it was rude; and came from a Preſbyterian with a very bad grace, as they are not in general, very attentive to decency in their religious ceremonies, and it will be proved immediately that, their ordinations can confer no power. On which account, if defect of authority makes ordinations farcical, we are, it ſeems, to imagine, none could be more farcical than his own. I ſay this, becauſe the learned Profeſſor's reaſon for calling the conſecration of our firſt poſt revolution Biſhops *farcical* was, on account of their not being made *diocesan* Biſhops! from which he inferred that they had not the full powers of the epiſcopate conferred upon them: than which there can be no greater miſtake. For although their conſecrators did not think it proper to fill the vacant Sees, becauſe to do *that*, was the province of the civil power, they inveſted them notwithſtanding with the plenitude of epiſcopal authority, having conſecrated for the expreſs purpoſe of ſupporting the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in Scotland, as their deeds of conſecration ſtill extant, clearly ſhew. And accordingly Biſhop Sage concurred with Biſhops Roſe and Douglas in the conſecration of Biſhop Falconer, at Dundee, Anno 1709; as did Biſhop Fullarton, with Roſe and Falconer in the conſecration of Biſhop Millar, in Edinburgh, October 22, 1718. Beſides, both Mr. Sage and Mr. Fullarton, having the charge of congregations when they were conſecrated, they became upon the death of Biſhop Roſe, ipſo facto, Biſhops of their reſpective flocks. And, notwithſtanding what our inconſiſtent Lecturer has ſaid of farcical conſecrations, they were upon his principles, more proper Biſhops than any dioceſan is, or can be; becauſe they had but *one* pariſh, *one* congregation, *one* church, or place of worſhip, and *one* altar, as was the caſe of the firſt Biſhops, if we may believe the Doctor. Indeed, with ſubmiſſion to the learned Profeſſor, his reaſoning againſt the epiſcopacy of the Scottiſh Church, is ſo weak, nonſenſical, and falſe, that even a ſenſible ſchool-boy would be aſhamed of it; on which account when one looks into the preliminary diſſertations to the new tranſlation of the Goſpels, or into the Eſſay on Miracles, or the Philoſophy of Rhetorick, and perceives, not only how juſtly, but how ably, Dr. Campbell could reaſon, one cannot but lament the *baſe* and yet *wilful* miſemployment of ſuch great talents.

Having now proved, I hope to the ſatisfaction of every impartial reader, that the Church of Scotland, has not merely Preſbyterial, but true and proper *Epiſcopal Ordination*, I will take the liberty to inquire into our learned Adverſary's miſſion; who, ſpeaking of his own Church, ſays, "whoever is ordained among us, is ordained a *Biſhop*, by a *claſs of Biſhops*." This is ſaid upon the ſuppoſition which his predeceſſors went upon, as his cotemporaries ſtill do, that Biſhop and Preſbyter, were in the Apoſtles' time, two names for the ſame office, which, although I truſt I ſhall ſay enough by and by to ſhew that it is not true, I ſhall take for granted at preſent, the more effectually to overturn the hypotheſis, and to confound our adverſaries. For, if I have any ſkill in logic, by adopting this doctrine, they have ruined their cauſe,

cauſe, as it clearly follows from hence, that no Preſbyterian Miniſter has a divine commiſſion (which not only the holy ſcripture, Matth. xxviii. 19, 20, but the confeſſion of faith requires, Larger catechiſm, Q. 176), to preach the goſpel or diſpenſe its ſacraments. To ſhorten the diſpute as much as poſſible, we ſhall not take time to enquire, whether the body of the Clergy in every church (who the Doctor tells us lived in a collegiate manner with a temporary moderator at their head), *resigned* the power of ordination to a favourite brother from henceforth to be denominated Biſhop, which is our learned Lecturer's opinion; or, whether the Biſhops, through art or intereſt, got that power appropriated to themſelves, againſt the will of the Preſbyters, as the generality of Preſbyterians ſuppoſe; becauſe, whether it was the one way, or the other, makes no odds. For we ſhall build our ſuperſtructure upon three facts, which are equally undeniable upon either ſuppoſition. The firſt, which Dr. Campbell maintains, Eccl. Lectures, p. 221, and which no other honeſt and ſenſible Preſbyterian will refuſe, that in the 3d century the Biſhops made laws or canons, prohibiting preſbyters to ordain, and reſtricting that power to their own order. The ſecond, which the hiſtory of the Church equally eſtabliſhes, that all the preſbyters in the world (Acrius and Colluthus, and perhaps one or two more excepted, who were depoſed as heretics), ſubmitted to thoſe canons, and acted under them, from that date down to the Reformation, a ſpace of more than 1200 years; and agreeable thereunto accepted of the office of Preſbyterate, in every country and church *without* the power of *ordination*, which the learned principal acknowledges, p. 355, "was ever reckoned the moſt *ſacred and important part* of the Epiſcopal office." Now, as it is a fact equally certain with the two former, that the power of ordination was never reſtored to the preſbyters in any part of Chriſtendom, and particularly not to Mr. Melville or any of the Scottiſh Reformers, hence it follows, without the poſſibility of doubt, that, none of the Scotch Reformers had the power of ordination, becauſe "that moſt ſacred and important part of the epiſcopal function was *withheld from them*" when they were appointed Miniſters. From which it follows again, that, by exerciſing that power which they had not received, they dared to uſurp an office to which they were not called by God, and therefore could not convey to others. In ſhort, it follows, that to the Scottiſh Reformers, "a *part* only of the miniſterial authority was committed," to ſpeak in Dr. Campbell's language, and that too the loweſt and leaſt important part, the right of *transmitting orders to others* not being given to them;—or what the learned Lecturer ſoon after falſely ſays of our Clergy, is true of his own, that, the Scotch Reformers, by accepting the office of the preſbyters *without* the power of ordination annexed to it, which the firſt Chriſtian Preſbyters were poſſeſſed of, became, ipſo facto, "a ſort of *ſubordinate* or inferior Miniſters" to thoſe firſt Preſbyters, and, therefore, were not like them, authorized to ordain; but according to Dr. Hammond's and Dr. Campbell's hypotheſis, "a kind of Miniſters who were not originally in the Church." Eccl. Lect. Vol. I. p. 357.

This reaſoning, though not of the ſame kind with mathematical demonſtration, is equally convincing, and ſeems incapable of receiving any ſolid anſwer. For what can the Preſbyterians urge againſt it? Will they ſay that the preſbyters of the 2d or 3d century, could not lawfully either *resign* their power of ordination, nor ſubmit to have it taken from them; and therefore that their ſucceſſors at the Reformation might with propriety *reſume* it? By no means. This does not follow. The unlawfulneſs of the act

act would have juſtified the reſumption of their former power, had the *reſigners themſelves* repented of the guilty deed; but that they never did; and the reformers lived at the diſtance of more than 1200 years from them, and accepted of the preſbyterate in the ſame imperfect ſtate that they left it, without that moſt ſacred and moſt important part of the epiſcopal office, the power of tranſmitting orders to others; and therefore could not reſume what they were never in poſſeſſion of. For which reaſon, their aſſumption of that ſupreme part of the epiſcopal office was, as juſt now obſerved, a *daring uſurpation*, and made them guilty of the dreadful crime of Corah, who periſhed for it by a moſt tremendous judgement, Numbers ch. xvi. For, as Corah, though only a Levite, preſumed to offer up incenſe, which was a part of the prieſt's office, in oppoſition to Aaron, God's appointed High Prieſt under the law; ſo the Scottiſh reformers dared to tranſmit orders to *others*, notwithſtanding that no ſuch power was committed to them; and that, too, in oppoſition to the Biſhops, God's appointed High Prieſts under the Goſpel.

Theſe facts, which unavoidably follow from our learned Lecturer, and his brethren's principles, clearly root up the very foundation of Preſbyterian orders; but, God be praiſed, do not in the ſmalleſt degree affect the miſſion of our Epiſcopal Churches; becauſe we derive our orders from thoſe, who in the ſecond century, were peculiarly called *Biſhops*; with whom, all the eccleſiaſtical powers which were committed by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, were continued; and who in no age, country, or church, were ever denied the power of ordination.

Meantime, although we have hitherto argued upon our learned Profeſſor's principles, his brother, Principal Robertſon's, (as mentioned in his hiſtory of Charles V.), Blondel, and in general of all the Preſbyterians, the more effectually to confute them, yet nothing is more certain than that their doctrine on the ſubject of church government is falſe. This has been unanſwerably proved by many able caſuiſts long ago; Archbiſhop Potter, Dr. Maurice, Mr. Slater, &c. &c. and of late by ſome of your correſpondents, in the Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine, for February, March, April, May, June, July, and September, 1801. And therefore I need only make this general obſervation, that, as there was no general council in the 2d or 3d centuries to authorize a change in the miniſtry, nor any Chriſtian King to compel it by his power, and as the Diſciples of our Lord were by that time diſperſed over the whole known world, and the correſpondence between diſtant churches was very difficult, and very expenſive, hence it is obvious that there was no cauſe exiſting in the Church at that early period, adequate to produce ſo great an effect, as (according to the Preſbyterian doctrine) then took place, viz. the ſubverſion of Chriſt's Miniſtry in every part of the earth. It could not poſſibly have been done without great noiſe, unleſs the whole body of the clergy had every where concurred; and nothing is more incredible, than that in their circumſtances, either of the parties ſhould have concurred. Not thoſe who were to become Biſhops, becauſe, in thoſe days of perſecution, being always expoſed to the front of the battle, and the firſt that ſuffered, and living daily in expectation of martyrdom, had they accepted of additional honour or power by the reſignation of their equal brethren, they would have made themſelves Lords over God's heritage, contrary to a divine command, and thereby would have fruſtrated their reward in heaven; and not the preſbyters, becauſe they could neither have *reſigned* the moſt important part, nor any

part indeed of the epiſcopal office, nor have ſuffered it to be *taken* from them, without degrading their own characters, contrary to the principles of human nature, and (which would have been a greater bar to good men), without betraying the truſt their Lord and Maſter had committed to them. What makes this the more improbable is, that not only the moſt pious, but, if we may judge from their exalted ſtation, the abler too, of the clergy at that time, were moſt remarkably tenacious even of apoſtolical *traditions*. Witneſs the diſpute between Pope Anicetus and St. Polycarp about keeping Eaſter; and can we then believe that *ſuch* men would have dared to alter their *Saviour's Inſtitutions?* moſt aſſuredly not. They would have been petrified at the thought, and trembled in every nerve. I may add, that had both biſhops and prieſts been capable of ſuch folly and wickedneſs, as the form of church government is an object of *ſenſe*, the alteration muſt have been *viſible* to the eyes of all men. Particularly, as our learned Lecturer informs us, that the change was little more than *begun* about the time of Juſtin Martyr, and was not quite finiſhed when Tertullian had arrived at manhood; both theſe Fathers muſt have ſeen many churches governed by a College of Preſbyters, with a temporary moderator at their head, had that been the primitive model, as Dr. Campbell tells us, and many other churches governed by a ſingle Biſhop, after the *new faſhion*, had that form of government been *then new*. But no ſuch alteration, nor any difference in the government of different churches, is taken notice of by either of them; which could not poſſibly have eſcaped the notice of ſuch able and inquiſitive men. On the contrary, it appears clearly from Tertullian's writings, that, in his judgement, all the churches in the world had, from the beginning, been governed by *ſingle perſons*. For, he calls upon the ſectaries to deduce the ſucceſſion of their paſtors from the *Apoſtles*, as the Catholic Church could. "Edant ergo, originem eccleſiarum ſuarum (ſays that able writer), evolvant ordinum Epiſcoporum ſuorum, ita per ſucceſſiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Epiſcopus, aliquem ex Apoſtolis, vel Apoſtoliciſ viris, qui tamen cum Apoſtolis perſeveraverit, habuerit auctorem et anicceſſorem. Hoc enim modo, eccleſiæ apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuos deferunt, ſicut Smyrnæorum eccleſiæ habens Polycarpum ab Joanne contocatum."

Now as this Father's credibility as a witneſs has never been called in queſtion, notwithſtanding of his montaniſm, his teſtimony is deciſive of the cauſe. Becauſe, had there been *any* churches then governed by a College of Preſbyters, or had it been then believed, that the church was originally ſo governed, it is impoſſible that any man but a fool would have uſed ſuch language, ſeeing all his acquaintances could have expoſed him to the world, and given him the lie direct. Indeed, had not the Apoſtles, and the other founders of churches cotemporary with them, eſtabliſhed epiſcopacy *every where*, it could not have obtained ſo early, and ſo univerſally in the world, as in fact it did. And had not thoſe who ſucceeded them, acted under an authority which they durſt neither gainſay nor reſiſt, a different form of church government muſt have been eſtabliſhed in various parts of the globe, had it been only to pleaſe the taſte of ſome of the founders themſelves, or to gratify the humours of the people among whom they laboured. But no ſuch difference in any age was ever ſeen until the reformation; or in any country, from the coaſt of Malabar to the North of Scotland: church government, therefore, is not an *arbitrary, fluctuating* thing, as our learned Lecturer, Sir Richard Hill, and other Latitudinarians, tell us; but is a queſtion, or matter, of the *greateſt conſequence*, becauſe it is eſſentially connected

with

with the adminiſtration of the Chriſtian ſacraments in the judgement even of the Eſtabliſhed Church, and by conſequence, is intimately connected with the ſalvation of mankind. "The ſpiritual part of both ſacraments, ſays the Larger Catechiſm, Q. 176, is Chriſt's and his benefits: both are ſeals of the ſame covenant; are to be diſpenſed *by Miniſters of the Goſpel, and none others*, and to be continued in the Church of Chriſt until his ſecond coming." Yet, our learned Profeſſor of Divinity, and Inſtructor of Candidates for Holy Orders, although he owns that "a certain model of church government *muſt* have been *orginally* adopted, by infinite wiſdom, for the more effectual preſervation of the evangelical inſtitution in its native purity, and for the careful tranſmiſſion of it to after ages," yet he gives it as his opinion that it is a *circumſtance only* not *connected with Chriſtianity*, and not a queſtion of ſo great conſequence, but made ſo by the intemperate zeal of ſome warm diſputants! Eccl. Lectures, 86, 87, "and therefore may be overturned by human authority, and another erected in its ſtead!" How aſtoniſhing ſuch wild doctrine, in ſo intelligent, and ſeemingly ſo pious a divine. May this, and his other raſh and dangerous dogmas, have been forgiven him, before he went hence, and was no more ſeen; and may all Preſbyterians of every denomination ſeriouſly conſider the important truth here diſcuſſed, embrace it in time, and be mindful of the other things which belong to their eternal peace before they be hid from their eyes.

So prays moſt ſincerely, Sir,

Your conſtant Reader and moſt humble Servant,

WM. ABERNETHY DRUMMOND, Biſhop.

P.S. It deſerves to be remarked that, although the learned Lecturer has very naturally condemned the ſeveral ſeceſſions from his own church, p. 187, he has found no fault with the *Presbyterian* ſeparations from our Epiſcopal Churches, notwithſtanding he acknowledges that Epiſcopacy may be lawfully ſubmitted to, and was not originally *uſurped* by the firſt Biſhops, but had it voluntarily yielded to them by their brethren, becauſe of their ſuperior virtues or abilities: and notwithſtanding he owns alſo that a "preſumptuous encroachment on a divine inſtitution, eſpecially when it tends to wound charity, and to promote ſtrife, is juſtly reprehenſible," p. 87. Notwithſtanding I ſay of all this, our learned principal finds no fault with the Preſbyterians for ſeparating at the Reformation, the Revolution, or which was ſtill more extraordinary, at the Synod of Glaſgow, anno 1638, when the inferior clergy *depoſed* their *Biſhops*, to whom they had ſolemnly promiſed canonical obedience, even without convicting them of any crime!!! Audacious men! tell it not in Gath, publiſh it not in the ſtreets of Aſkelon!! Yet, as Epiſcopacy *was* eſtabliſhed in the 3d century, (according to Dr. Campbell), an inſtitution of near 1300 years ſtanding, I think I may ſay, (after what has been proved), that, a *divine inſtitution of more than* 1500 *years ſtanding* was then "preſumptuouſly encroached upon" by that atrocious deed, and that charity alſo was thereby more mortally wounded, and ſtrife more promoted than by the ſeceſſion of the Erſkencies from the Scottiſh Eſtabliſhment, anno 1733, or by any ſeparation from the Kirk, or among the ſeceders ever ſince! Now, as it cannot be denied, after what has been proved, that by theſe preſbyterian ſeparations from the Epiſcopal Churches, Chriſt's inſtitutions were encroached upon, and peace and love very much deſtroyed in Scotland at thoſe different periods, our learned Profeſſor, to render the miſchiefs which thoſe diviſions had occaſioned, ſo far as he was

able, inſtead of vindicating the ſchiſm of the Preſbyterians, was in juſtice bound to return himſelf, and to exhort his brethren alſo to return, to the Epiſcopal reformed Churches from which they had ſtrayed; for, ſince Epiſcopacy may lawfully be ſubmitted to, and the Articles of the Church of England are far more unexceptionable, and more eaſily defenſible, than thoſe of the confeſſion of Faith, even where they ſeem to agree, therefore there could be no ſufficient cauſe for the ſeparation at any of thoſe periods; and of conſequence the ſchiſm was wilful and highly criminal.

I know that this is an age of free thinking, as well as free acting in many different reſpects: and it is much to be regretted that Dr. Campbell did not, and that his brethren do not yet ſee, the *danger* and *guilt* of rending the myſtical body of Chriſt in pieces, as our Lord, his apoſtles, St. Ignatius, and the other primitive fathers ſaw it: becauſe, in that caſe, we ſhould have had more peace in Sion, and more love and friendſhip in the world than there now is. But from the whole tenor of the doctor's lectures, and alſo of his ſermon on the ſpirit of the Goſpel, preached in the preſence of, and approved by, the ſynod of Aberdeen, Anno 1771, it is evident, that he laid no ſtreſs on Church government, nor on Chriſtian unity, but thought it juſt as ſafe to be a ſeceder as a preſbyterian; or an epiſcopalian, as either. In ſhort, it is evident that the doctor ſaw not the *neceſſity* of Chriſtians being of *one communion*, as the firſt diſciples of our Lord moſt certainly were, Luke ii. 42.; and as our Bleſſed Saviour as certainly intended, they ſhould *always be*. John xvii. 20. 21. It is true, we ought not to judge unfavourably of any man's ſtate becauſe of his ſect, provided that he is ſober, decent, and religious in his own way; but, while we take care to be members of a pure part of Chriſt's flock ourſelves, ſhould leave him to be judged by God, whoſe mercy is over all his works, and who knows how to make allowances for the errors and treſpaſſes of his frail creatures. And although it be alſo true, that no man will be ſaved by the purity of his church, unleſs his belief be ſound, and his life moral; becauſe, without *faith* it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, and without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord, yet, this notwithſtanding, to maintain that *oppoſite communions* are *equally ſafe*, or that the church may be lawfully *divided*, when no ſinful term of communion is required, although it is by many in theſe days, conſidered as a charitable and *liberal* ſentiment, it is directly contradictory to our Bleſſed Saviour's doctrine, and to the general tenor of the New Teſtament. Indeed, if the church may be *cauſeleſsly* divided, and unity in communion is not neceſſary, why are we forbidden to neglect the aſſembling of ourſelves together as the manner of ſome is? why are they who ſeparated from the Apoſtles, ſaid to go *out* from the Apoſtles, and to be no longer members of the church? John ii. 19. Why are both the inferior prieſts and people commanded to obey them that have the rule over them, and to ſubmit themſelves becauſe they watch for their ſouls? Heb. xiii. 17. Why are we ſo earneſtly exhorted, Rom. xvi. 16. to *mark* them who cauſe *diviſions*, and avoid them? Why were the Corinthians, and in them, all Chriſtians, ſo pathetically called upon, in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *all* to ſpeak the *ſame thing*, and that there be no *diviſions*, literally no *ſchiſms* among them, but to be *perfectly joined together in the ſame mind, and in the ſame judgement?* 1 Cor. i. 10.; with many ſuch like texts. But, above all, why did our Bleſſed Saviour pray four times, for *unity* to his church, in the courſe of a few ſentences, among the laſt moments of his life? John xvii. 20, 21.; and that too, to be a proof of his divinity

vinity and of his being the true Meſſiah. "Neither pray I for theſe *alone*, (meaning his Apoſtles), but for *them alſo, who ſhall believe in me through their word* (that is, his whole church), *that they all may be one, as Thou Father art in me, and I in Thee, that they alſo may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou haſt ſent me?*" That this prayer may imply a petition for the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, to direct the firſt diſciples, as Dr. Whitby ſuppoſes, I ſhall not diſpute; but that it is a prayer for peace, unity and concord among them alſo, and that the general intention of it is to point out the danger of diſcord and diviſion in the church, is, in my judgment, certain; becauſe it is the moſt natural and obvious meaning of the words: and what is the moſt natural and obvious meaning of any text, when agreeable to the analogy of faith, we may juſtly conclude to be the *true* and *real meaning* of the Holy Spirit. Our Bleſſed Lord foreſaw, that if his diſciples ſhould ſplit into factions, inſtead of continuing united in one great and ſacred body, the wicked world, his enemies, heathens, faithleſs Jews, Mahometans, deiſts, &c. would, in every age, take occaſion to blaſpheme his holy name; would deny him to be a divine perſon, and ſay, that God his Father had not ſent him, becauſe he had not preſerved his church united, as he anxiouſly wiſhed to do. To prevent this reproach, and becauſe he knew that diviſions would engender ſtriſe, and deſtroy peace and love, the badge of his divine religion, therefore did he ſo earneſtly and frequently pray, that his diſciples might continue in one holy ſociety, and in one mind, and the ſame judgment, even as he and his Father are one. Wherefore ſeeing our unhappy diviſions operate ſo dreadfully againſt the eternal Son of God, that they cauſe him to be reviled, and treated as an impoſtor, can there be a crime greater than ſchiſm is? No: it is impoſſible for the greateſt genius that ever lived, a Bacon, or a Newton, to conceive any thing more criminal, than deliberately to cauſe the Saviour of the world to be blaſphemed, and the wicked world to ſay that his Divine Father did not ſend him. I am willing to believe, that few who commit this ſin ſee the ſad conſequences of their conduct, and *deliberately* tranſgreſs: but whatever they may either *perceive* or *intend*, all who cauſeleſsly divide any pure part of Chriſt's flock, actually do the *thing*; and although they ſhould mean *well*, which ſeditious people rarely do, the beſt intention will no more vindicate them, than it did Saul when he perſecuted our Lord's diſciples. Indeed, ſince the conſequences of ſchiſm are ſo baneful, what wonder that St. Paul, Gal. v. 20. ranks διχοστασιαι *ſeditions* (which ought to be rendered *diviſions* as it is Rom. xvi. 16,) in the black catalogue which excludes from the kingdom of Heaven? what wonder that St. Cyprian hath ſaid, "He cannot have *God* for his Father, who hath not the *Church* for his mother, and that the Church of England teaches all her children to pray—"From hereſy and ſchiſm, Good Lord, deliver us!" If it ſeem ſtrange that ſchiſm ſhould be ſo great a crime, when it may be committed without departing from the *faith*, or the breach of what is commonly reckoned the rules of morality, let it be conſidered, that it is the *bare act of ſeparating* from the church, which Chriſt himſelf tells us, cauſeth his name to be blaſphemed, and which gives the wicked world a handle to ſay, that he is not *a divine perſon*, becauſe he either wanted wiſdom to deviſe a proper plan, or power to carry it into effect, for keeping his followers united, and then all wonder muſt ceaſe, and the great guilt of *diviſion* immediately appear. Wherefore, ſince we learn from St. Jude that the ſin of Corah may be committed under the Goſpel, as well as under the law, and we

alſo muſt be ſenſible, that becauſe his puniſhment was dreadful, Numb. xvi. 32. his guilt muſt have been great, let all denominations of Chriſtians anxiouſly enquire, whether by dividing the Church of God when no ſinful term of communion was required, they are not involved in that enormous crime; and if they are, as alas! too many, if their inquiry is fair, will find they are, let them for God's ſake and their own, immediately return into the true ſheepfold, that they may find reſt to their ſouls. And let thoſe who on good ground ſhall be convinced that they have not wandered from Chriſt's flock, thank God for his mercy, and earneſtly pray, that from hereſy, and ſchiſm, and every evil work, their good Lord may continue to deliver and preſerve them!

W. A. D.

Comments on Mr. Hardcastle's Defence of the Missionary Society.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

WHEN I firſt determined, as far as laid in my little power, to exert my mental faculties in defence of our highly reſpected Conſtitution, I certainly had no intention to commit myſelf in controverſy with ſuch *great men* as the conductors of the Miſſionary Society; but when aſſertions are advanced which I know to be falſe, I ſhould deem myſelf extremely culpable if I ſhould heſitate for one moment in adopting that line of conduct which duty moſt evidently points out: for though religion ought certainly to be held ſacred by us all, yet it has already been made the maſk to conceal ſo many flagitious deſigns that whenever we meet with any thing *ſuſpicious* either in the doctrines themſelves; their mode of propagation; or the characters of their propagators; I do hold that we are bound in the moſt ſacred obligation to God; in juſtice to ourſelves, and in duty to our fellow-ſubjects, to ſcrutinize them with all our diſcriminating powers under the full conviction that the truth, or genuine Chriſtianity, will loſe nothing by the diſcuſſion. A gentleman who profeſſes himſelf to have been a director of the Miſſionary Society from its firſt riſe, and an attender at all its meetings, aſſerts, as his firſt fact in defence of that ſociety in your No. for February, "that he has never once heard a political ſubject introduced." I feel myſelf extremely unwilling to give this gentleman the *retort courteous* which every utterer of a premeditated falſehood certainly deſerves, and I therefore think myſelf lucky in this inſtance that Mr. Cockin, in his ſermon preached before the ſociety, takes moſt completely the unpleaſant taſk from my ſhoulders, for this ſermon is *highly political*. The ſecond fact adduced by Mr. Hardcaſtle is, "that the direct tendency of *all* their proceedings, both in the *diſtribution* of *Tracts* and Village-preaching, and in Sunday-ſchools, is to call off the attention of the lower orders of the people from *political ſubjects*; and this effect has been produced in a very remarkable and extenſive degree." Upon the firſt part of this aſſertion I beg leave to remark, that Mr. Crabtree, the old diſſenting Miniſter at Bradford, was the gentleman who *collected my contribution* for the Miſſionary Society; and that the ſame old diſſenting Miniſter was, to his everlaſting diſgrace, the *diſtributor* of that *ſmall tract*, before frequently noticed by the inquirer in his writings,

which

which contains as much *political poiſon* as was, perhaps, ever condenſed into ſo ſmall a compaſs: with reſpect to the latter clauſe in this ſweeping aſſertion, the Inquirer begs leave to declare that in the circle of his obſervation which has been pretty extenſive, exactly the reverſe has taken place, and that he has known only one ſingle inſtance, and that occurred in the Methodiſt connexion not the Miſſionary, where Mr. Hardcaſtle's aſſertion has been verified. This gentleman ventures, however, to obſerve further, "that he is well perſuaded one cauſe of the *tranquillity* of the poor which diſtinguiſhes the *preſent* from thoſe ſcenes of diſorder and principles of diſorganiſation which prevailed ſeven years ago, is to be traced to the exertions to which he has referred." But, Sir, does, does not every man in the kingdom know that the tranquillity of the poor has been regularly *diminiſhing* from the era he mentions; and that the principles of diſorganization have as regularly increaſed, till information was laid before Government, no longer ſince than laſt year, of conſpirators ſworn to the amount of thouſands to overturn the Conſtitution, in conſequence of which Deſpard and his diſſenting methodiſtic friends have been ſent into eternity; and are conſidered by ſome as martyrs to the cauſe of *freedom* and *religion?* The next allegation that claims our notice is, "ſhould it happen that any one of the teachers ſhould ever ſo far forget his duty as to introduce political ſubjects, he would immediately be diſmiſſed by the ſociety with which he is connected." I do indeed, Sir, feel myſelf intitled to aſk after peruſing this, if the *upright* Mr. Crabtree, though long ago convicted of doing this, if Dr. Haweis reeking at this moment under the laſh of Dean Milman, and the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers for doing this: I do beg leave to aſk if Mr. Cockin, condemned by his own ſermon and the reprehenſions of the Magiſtrate, under whoſe eye he had the audacity to offend in this inſtance; I do beg leave to aſk if all or any of theſe gentlemen have been *diſmiſſed* from the *Miſſionary Society* for their evil deeds? I believe, Sir, it will be ſcarcely requiſite to notice the ſtale diſſenting trick to which this gentleman deſcends, when he can find neither truth nor argument ſufficient in the barren wilds of ſchiſm to attach our credence to his aſſertions; for I have no doubt but you have already paid it ſufficient attention: permit me, however, to obſerve, that there is no little lack of *integrity* in firſt denominating the well *ſupported complaints* againſt itinerants *calumny*, and then modeſtly aſſerting that this calumny is faſt dying away, when it is a notorious fact, that the laſt champion who appeared in the cauſe, as pompous as his Holineſs was at the outſet, has ſlunk away from the conflict, and left upon the public mind the full conviction that his poſitions are altogether untenable.

I have the honour to remain, Sir,
Your moſt obedient humble Servant,

Bradford, April 15, 1803. THE INQUIRER.

Attorney General's Pledge to bring forward a New Adultery Bill.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

I WAS exceedingly pleaſed with your criticiſm on Dr. Booker's Poem, CALISTA, at p. 180, &c. of your Review for Feb. 1803. I perfectly accord with your great and juſt ſeverity on the crime of ADULTERY, which

you tell us the above mentioned poem diſcuſſes; as well as your pointed animadverſions on ſome very exalted male and female votaries thereof, who by their conduct have outraged common decency, broken down the barriers which ſhould ever be preſerved inviolate between *virtue* and *vice*, and proceeded very far in the deep laid conſpiracy of laughing Chriſtian morality out of countenance, and baniſhing decorum from the face of the earth.

Moſt cordially do I ſubſcribe to the truth of Doctor Booker's remark, which you have quoted with approbation, that "the *indifference* of many females" (even in the higheſt ranks of ſociety) "to the culpable and vicious conduct of thoſe with whom they aſſociate, is *a very copious ſource of the national depravity*." You have moſt courageouſly pointed the finger of obſervation to the conduct of an individual whom you diſtinguiſh by the epithet of "*the proudeſt peer in his Majeſty's dominions*," and his very immoral and ſhameful protection of an ADULTERESS, who, inſtead of being driven with juſt contempt and indignation from the ſociety of all thoſe who have the ſmalleſt pretenſions to the character of modeſty, hath been countenanced and viſited by numbers of the *moſt faſhionable* perſonages of the kingdom, and, as you emphatically expreſs it, "hath been received with open arms by perſons of high" (it may be added, of the *higheſt*) "rank." What ſhall we think of a paragraph appearing in the public newſpapers, *very lately*, which announces that THE MOST FASHIONABLE IMPURE in the united kingdom, on the occaſion of ſome ASSEMBLIES which ſhe gave on three diſtinct nights, had "five hundred people of the *firſt faſhion* each of the *three* nights!!!" Is VICE then become ſo *faſhionable* that it vaunts itſelf thus publicly in defiance of decency and common propriety? And ſhall *the very exalted ſtation* of thoſe who practice, or of them who uphold and countenance it, tie up the tongues or reſtrain the pens of the friends of VIRTUE? No! thank heaven, we are not yet ſo totally ſunk in the whirlpool of vice and degeneracy as to be *afraid* of ſpeaking the language of truth, of holding up the deteſtable form of vice to the public ſcorn and indignation, and of guarding the true friends of virtue from her deceitful allurements, whenever the preſſing neceſſities of the times imperiouſly demand it.

To the invitation you have held out to the friends of morality and virtue at p. 181 of your Magazine for Feb. 1803, I moſt readily attend, and ſtep forward a ready and willing volunteer in the glorious cauſe you have undertaken to defend; under your banners with great cheerfulneſs do I enliſt myſelf, and with ardour and ſincerity am ready to contribute my mite, ſmall and inconſiderable though it be, to the ſupport of decency and the advancement of religion amongſt the ſons of men. Let the friends of religion bravely rally round her ſtandard—let thoſe to whom decency and morality are yet dear, unanimouſly and heartily join their exertions, and the fall of this our country (*rich, luxurious*, and *corrupted* though indeed it is) may for ſome conſiderable time be *retarded*. Fall indeed it of neceſſity muſt, when the whole maſs of fluids which circulate through the body politic become entirely corrupted; when the heart becomes ſick, and the whole conſtitution thoroughly tainted with the contagion of vice; but as yet let us hope there are many times "ten righteous perſons" to be found whoſe virtues may plead loudly at the throne of grace and mercy to prevent the awful downfall of our ſtate. May the endeavours of theſe good and righteous perſons be ſucceſsfully exerted to ſtem the torrent of licentiouſneſs

tiouſneſs by which we are overwhelmed, and to correct the moral evils which now abound amongſt us!!

Should you approve of the ſpecimen here preſented to you of the principles of your correſpondent, and deem them worthy of a place in your Magazine, you will encourage me to ſend you very ſpeedily a critique on two very popular plays, the production of a celebrated German dramatiſt, the evident deſign of which was moſt undoubtedly to "ſtrip Vice of her deformity, familiarize Innocence with Crime, and render ADULTERY an object of courteous contemplation; and thereby deſtroy thoſe limits which have hitherto ſeparated" (and ought ever to ſeparate) "the bad from the good."

No one can deplore more ſincerely than myſelf the obſtacles (for ſuch we muſt in all fair conſtruction and charity ſuppoſe there have been) which have oppoſed themſelves to the publicly declared intention of his Majeſty's Attorney General to bring into Parliament a new ADULTERY BILL, for which, as you juſtly obſerve, "he ſtand ſolemnly pledged to the public," and for the hitherto non-performance of which I feel diſpoſed to give him credit for being able ſatisfactorily to account. The virtuous part of the community have by no means loſt ſight of this intereſting ſubject, which every well-diſpoſed perſon muſt, with a glance of thought, perceive to be indiſpenſibly neceſſary in the preſent corrupted ſtate of manners amongſt that exalted claſs of the community who upon every conſideration ought to ſet a very different example to the inferior orders of their fellow ſubjects. Allow me, in particular, to ſay that in common with yourſelf I have conſtantly looked for, and ardently deſired the production of this long expected Bill, and have to lament that my hopes on this head have been hitherto diſappointed. Still, however, do I cheriſh the hope that ere long the Attorney General will take care that his "pledge ſhall be redeemed"—that he will produce a Bill efficacious in its operation—that a puniſhment commenſurate to the heinouſneſs of the offence * will be inflicted on thoſe who

---

* I very greatly approve of the extract which you have given to your readers, at p. 183, of your laſt February Magazine, from Sibbett's "*Diſſertation on the Influence of Luxury*," concerning the mode of puniſhment for the abovementioned crime; allow me to preſent you with an extract from a very ſenſible and well-written little tract, publiſhed anonymouſly in the year 1799, by *Meſſrs. Rivingtons*, intituled "*Thoughts on Marriage and Criminal Converſation, &c. &c.*" wherein the grounds and reaſons of the puniſhment which the writer recommends are ſet forth in a very judicious manner, in the following words:

"To looſe the graſp of faſhion—to check the vanity of aſpirers to profligate diſtinction—and to turn the reſtleſsneſs of oſtentation to ſome leſs noxious channel, it is evident that a remedy muſt be ſought which will include in its *ſeverity* as much of *mortification* and *public ſhame* as may be conſiſtent with *juſtice*. No one indeed can queſtion how difficult, if not impoſſible, it is to induce the ſenſe of ſhame on a mind already callous to ſocial affection; but VANITY may be mortified, PRIDE may be humbled, and the wretch who would gladly ſacrifice the world to thoſe deſtructive paſſions, may, by the force of laws, be placed in ſuch a ſituation as to reverſe

who are guilty of it—and that thoſe, who cannot be prevailed on by a ſenſe of religion, duty, or common honeſty, to abſtain from it, will however in ſome meaſure be reſtrained by thoſe *temporal pains* and *penalties* which it is to be apprehended the framers of the Bill will find abſolutely neceſſary to attach to it.

I am, Sir, your very humble ſervant,

Φιλαρετης.

The Blagdon Controversy.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

ONE of your correſpondents, in your Magazine for February, 1803, who ſigns himſelf Senex, and dates his letter from *Briſtol*, hath in a very temperate and modeſt manner, endeavoured to ſet you right in regard "to the account you have given of the Rev. T. Drewitt, Curate of Cheddar," &c. and in that and other circumſtances relating to this controverſy ſuppoſes "you have been impoſed upon by the movers and abettors of it." Give me leave to ſay, Sir, that in this ſentiment myſelf and many others perfectly agree, and that we are extremely ſorry to perceive that you have taken ſo very decided a part *on one ſide* of the queſtion, as in the opinion of many impartial men to ſcarcely give fair play to the *other*. Perhaps you may not be ſenſible of this, but it is notwithſtanding very certainly the opinion of many of your readers, who, in general, highly approve of "your zeal in ſupport of our eſtabliſhment in Church and State."

Mr. Editor, I am a clergyman of the eſtabliſhed Church, and as warm an advocate for it as yourſelf can poſſibly be. and alſo an equal enemy to the *enthuſiaſtic hypocriſy* of the people called Methodists, from a frequent and attentive obſervation of the ſerious miſchiefs which their tenets have produced, and are daily producing, in ſociety: and if I could feel perſuaded that this leaven exiſted in the alarming manner which the Blagdon Curate has aſſerted it does in ſeveral perſons whom he mentions in his pamphlets, ſhould think more favourably of his cauſe (though not of the *manner* in which he hath ſuſtained it) than I now do. But in ſome in-

---

verſe his wiſh, and make him deſirous of ſacrificing his paſſions to the world. To effect this purpoſe the expedient here propoſed is, that for every proved offence of ſeduction the offender ſhould ſuffer, either with or without pecuniary mulct, *a confinement for a limited time in Newgate, or any other public jail in the kingdom.* The reaſon for what is here ſtated is obvious. It may fairly be preſumed, that how looſe ſoever our manners may be, we are not yet arrived at ſuch a pitch of hardihood that any man ſhould find a ſubject of gratification to *vanity* in declaring that *he had been for ſo many months confined in the cells of Newgate*; were there ſuch men, the pillory (and, permit me to add, *corporal puniſhment*) might be a proper addition to their ſentence." See "Thoughts," &c. p. 54.

If to the abovementioned puniſhments Mr. Sibbett's plan of *ſolitary confinement* were added, my word for it, this crime would be ſpeedily and effectually checked!!

ſtances

ſtances I know he has miſtated and exaggerated facts, and therefore am inclined to think he has done ſo in others. I think it neceſſary to ſtate my principles in the clear and expreſs manner I have done above, that you may not imagine that what follows proceeds from any affection to METHODISTS, or their cauſe. It is my misfortune, Mr. Editor, not to ſee the conduct of the principal parties implicated in the above Controverſy in the ſame light as you do; in particular, I do not think the conduct of the BLAGDON RECTOR ſo very culpable as you appear to do, or that of the BLAGDON CURATE ſo commendable.

The productions which have iſſued from the pen of the BLAGDON CURATE, and which have come before the public eye through the medium of the preſs, ſeem to me to breathe in every ſentence a ſpirit ſo diametrically oppoſite to that of the goſpel of the crucified Saviour of mankind, that from the moment of my ſeeing his firſt production on this ſubject my mind, I confeſs, was irreſiſtibly alienated from him and his cauſe. PRIDE and SELF-SUFFICIENCY appear to me very prominent features in moſt of the productions of the BLAGDON CURATE during this Controverſy; and thoſe frequent inſtances of *miſrepreſentation* and *untruth*, both reſpecting himſelf and his RECTOR, which ſo frequently appear in them, very greatly detract from the merits of his cauſe. The only inſtance of judgment which, in my humble opinion, the CURATE hath exhibited in this long protracted Controverſy, is that of ſeizing the ſubject of METHODISM, againſt which the tide of your remarks and of other periodical conſtitutional writers is juſt now directed, as an handle and pretext to advance the object (that of his own aggrandizement or preferment) which he appears to have had conſtantly in view.

The BLAGDON RECTOR has been greatly miſrepreſented by his CURATE throughout the Controverſy, and for this reaſon may have appeared to you to have been guilty of unhandſome conduct. By partially ſtating ſome facts relating to the leaſe of the living of BLAGDON, and inſidiouſly ſuppreſſing others, the CURATE hath made his RECTOR's conduct appear culpable, but if the CURATE's arts in the above affair were fully developed, a very different opinion would prevail. As to the SCHOOLMASTER's bias to *Methodism*, the oſtenſible, though not real cauſe of this Controverſy, the CURATE in the ſtrongeſt poſſible terms had ſome years before recommended him to his RECTOR's notice, as a man peculiarly well qualified to undertake the care of a *Sunday-ſchool*; and becauſe an inquiry was inſtituted into the quantum of this *Methodiſtical taint*, the indignation of the CURATE was excited in the indecent manner which to his diſgrace is before the public. The BLAGDON RECTOR you may depend upon it is no more tainted with the enthuſiaſtic madneſs of *Methodism*, than is your very humble ſervant,

April 22, 1803. VERITAS.

P. S. I hope your love of CANDOUR and TRUTH will induce you to give a place to the above letter in your valuable Miſcellany.

Having ſuffered *Veritas* to ſpeak for himſelf, we ſhall now take the liberty of ſuggeſting to him, that it is not very conſiſtent with the character which he has aſſumed, to accuſe a clergyman, who is the miniſter of TRUTH, of having advanced UNTRUTHS, without adducing a ſingle fact in ſupport of his aſſertion. Nor is it, he muſt allow us to obſerve, very decent ſo to attack, anonymouſly, a gentleman who has prefixed his name to every production

production of his pen. It is not by the ſimple affirmative of any individual; it is not by artful inuendoes, ſecret whiſpers, or dark inſinuations; nor yet, by exerting private influence to check inquiry and to ſtop up the channels of public information; arts, all of which have been, again and again, employed by the advocates and abettors of Mrs. More, that the *damning proofs* which have been exhibited in the courſe of this Controverſy, can be repelled or weakened. If her friends be wiſe, they will henceforth refrain from the uſe of weapons which recoil on themſelves, and if the lady herſelf have the courage to read every thing which has been written on the ſubject, (moſt of which we have been given to underſtand has been withholden from her by the ſingular prudence of her ſiſters) and have ſtill any regard left for her own reputation, ſhe will even now, better late than never, ſpeak for herſelf, and in her own name; breaking that pertinacious ſilence, which, whatever the flattering fools that ſurround her, intent only on adminiſtering food to her vanity, may ſay, is alike detrimental to her cauſe, and injurious to her character.

SECRET SOCIETIES *in* SWEDEN *and the* NORTH *of* GERMANY.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

AFTER all the acknowledged influence of Secret Societies *abroad*, their known promotion of revolutionary meaſures, and though the life of the Britiſh ſovereign * has been repeatedly threatened by the branches of the revolutionary *ſcion* in this capital; yet, probably, becauſe ſeveral conſpiracies juſt upon the eve of execution have been fortunately or caſually diſcovered, the indifference of the nation at large as to the *diſcovery*, *expoſure*, and *latent cauſes* of theſe violent eruptions, is really ſingular. To Barruel, though a *foreigner*, and Profeſſor Robiſon, who have written on theſe infidel and myſtical aſſociations abroad, the public attention has been generally and particularly directed, as if the political frenzy they have treated of, had *only* a *local habitation*; or was a real, and rare *exotic!*

Thus the accurate knowledge of ſimilar plants of our own growth, excepting to the readers of the Anti-Jacobin Review, and a very few publications beſides, ſeems to have been induſtriouſly concealed.†

After all, perhaps, to excite ſedition by any extenſive intrigue or cloſeneſs of connection is not yet in the character of Engliſhmen—Religion is a cement that the modern builders of philoſophical or new ſyſtems have moſtly rejected—Plots however againſt kingdoms and nations have not ceaſed, even with the French revolution—And, as we cannot diſcredit the official documents publiſhed by the Court of Stockholm, though the con-

---

* About the time the adherents of the late Colonel Deſpard were to make the attempt to aſſaſſinate his Majeſty in the Park, a private ſociety in this city debated the queſtion—Whether the aſſaſſination of Cæſar by Brutus was a laudable act? This is an undoubted fact.

† Reſpecting the publication here alluded to, the *approbation* of two learned and celebrated *biſhops* have not been adequate to the *diſapprobation* of an obſcure *bookſeller*.

tents

tents of them may yet be new to the general reader, the particulars cannot be unintereſting to the more ſage and philoſophical obſerver, who has been in the habit of calculating upon the great power of the democratical ferment, and the amazing efficacy of that ſour leaven that would fain mingle with the whole maſs. Sweden then, and the North of Germany, in 1808, have been the laſt ſtage of this kind of conſpiracy, the Secretary of Court, Karl Boheman, according to various accounts from Stockholm, through his mode of living, and the reports of his adventures, is ſaid to have excited an unfavourable opinion in the public mind—his pretended myſteries, his feigned viſions and revelations; his indecorous interference in politics, and his preſumptuous predictions reſpecting the fate of various ſtates, excited the ſuſpicion of government, which was increaſed by their conſideration of the manner in which he had obtained the wealth he poſſeſſed.

After various attempts to conceal the truth, the culpability of his views has been confirmed by irrefragable proofs, and a confeſſion that he was actuated partly by ſelf-intereſt and partly by ambition, which, with the affectation and aſſiſtance of myſtery, and that propenſity which certain characters poſſeſs for the ſupernatural at the expence of common ſenſe, were the degrees by which he promiſed himſelf to arrive at his object. Theſe aſſumptions were aſſiſted by an order of the influence of which he meant to avail himſelf.—His political ſpeculations he confeſſed, ſince his late apprehenſion, were crude, and his predictions without foundation; but with reſpect to the increaſe of his fortune, after many abſurd and contradictory ſtatements, he not only aggravated the ſuſpicion as to the means he had uſed of increaſing it, but finally profeſſed to have owed it intirely to the liberality of a perſon of diſtinction out of the country.

The papers found in Boheman's poſſeſſion, were examined in his preſence, and being by him acknowledged, after being marked, were ſeverally ſealed.

Theſe papers chiefly conſiſted of a foreign correſpondence by letters, ſome of them from perſons abroad, ſtrongly marked by ſome political deciſions, calculations and propoſals which probably attached to a very extenſive and well connected plan, the period for a developement of which had not arrived; and though ſuch an epoch was ſufficiently evident, and muſt have been formidable, the enquirers did not flatter themſelves that they were then in the poſſeſſion of the whole clue of evidence, as to the full extent of the relations and connections of the plan in queſtion.

Boheman's pretended revelations being ſupported by the boldeſt and moſt confident attempts upon perſons of all ranks, are acknowledged to have had no ſmall effect; and it is farther aſſerted, upon the authority of documents found in his poſſeſſion, that he was a principal perſon among the pretended adepts who are diſtinguiſhed by the name of the *Aſiatic Brotherhood.*

According to ſubſequent enquiries, the laws and the organization of the order to which Boheman belonged, are pregnant with the abuſe of the fundamentals of Chriſtianity—what is the moſt worthy to be known of them, as they reſpect found politics, is the government of the ſociety by an *unknown council*, endowed with unlimited powers; and to whom obedience was ſecured from the brotherhood, by an oath of inviolable ſecreſy, never to diſcloſe the reſidence of the governing aſſembly, nor the names of the brotherhood; and alſo to juſtify the aſſumption of its power over all *governments, people* and *nations, war* and *peace, life* and *death*; as thus much is apparent

parent, from a document found in Boheman's poſſeſſion: upon theſe principles of an unlimited confidence, and a paſſive obedience to the commands of its *unknown council*, the whole ſyſtem of this order is founded. The great abuſes to which ſuch aſſociations are ſubject could not long eſcape the vigilance of the Swediſh government.

This order ſeems to have had its origin in the ſouth of Germany: only its too rapid ſpread, and a certain controverſial paper, excited, according to Boheman's acknowledgment, ſuch an alarm, that the ſuperiors of the order, were for ſome time, obliged to ſuſpend ſome of their meetings. Hence, with a view to elude the obſervation of the public, Boheman was induced to change the name of the ſociety, and in a great meaſure to alter the places of meeting. This he effected by eſtabliſhing a new chapter at various places in Sweden, Denmark, and the North of Germany—the latter are thoſe lately diſcovered. But under other names, the aſſociation ſtill retained the ſame laws and regulations; the ſame unlimited obedience to the *unknown council*; and the ſame religious ceremonies to thoſe of the *Aſiatic Brotherhood.* The only difference between them and all other aſſociations, is the novelty, which admits of the admiſſion of females into the ſociety. From theſe premiſes it is inferred, that the organization and order of this ſociety are in direct oppoſition to civil ſubordination, religion, and morality; and that Boheman, as a principal, is the more highly culpable.

Upon Boheman's plea, that though a Swede by birth, he had been a very conſiderable time ſettled in Denmark, where he is the owner of landed property, the king of Sweden recommended the meaſure of delivering him up to the Daniſh government.

In conſequence of the facts abovementioned, the Lieutenant-governor of Stockholm, by virtue of a royal mandate, dated March 26, 1803, has publiſhed the following remarkable ordinance.

" Since his Majeſty has been informed, that in this capital, as well as in other provinces and towns of this kingdom, various ſocieties or orders, ſo called, have been formed, whoſe members have been initiated from one degree to another by the adminiſtration of oaths, and otherwiſe united by obligations of various kinds: His Majeſty, not to ſuffer any of theſe obligations to prejudice morality, religion, or civil ſubordination, has thought proper to oblige all chiefs, or thoſe who are at the head of ſuch aſſociations, under pain of caſſation of the order, without delay, to inform the Lieutenant-governor of their reſidence, and in the provinces, the governors or principal perſons, not only of the formulary of their oaths and obligations which are adminiſtered upon the reception of their members of all degrees, but alſo of the particulars and the principal object of the aſſociation. The documents received by the Lieutenant-governor of Stockholm, and the governors of the provinces, are to be tranſmitted to the King, which, when reviſed, are to be returned to the ſaid chiefs, as a rule for their ſocieties. His Majeſty has likewiſe enjoined, that no new order ſhall be eſtabliſhed in future, unleſs proper notice be given and the aforeſaid conditions obſerved, under pain of a penalty of fifty ſix dollars for each perſon ſo illegally admitted, and which penalty for each perſon enjoying any office under government, and offending againſt theſe regulations, is to be doubled. The Lieutenant-governor of Stockholm, and the governors of the provinces, ſhall alſo have free acceſs to all the ſocieties without being obliged to become members of the ſame. Whenever they may demand information of the particulars of each ſociety, it ſhall not be refuſed, under pain of caſſation

of

of the order. The Lieutenant-governor of Stockholm, and the governors of the provinces, as alſo the officers of the police, by virtue of their office, ſhall likewiſe have free entrance into the ſocieties, but under the obligation of keeping ſilence, as are alſo the members of theſe ſocieties, in every thing not immediately relative to the inſtitution, or that, which by virtue of their office, there is a neceſſity for them to expreſs."

The Freemaſons, ſtanding under his Majeſty's immediate protection, are alone excepted from this inſpection, and the effects of this general order.

Society for the Suppression of Vice.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir, *London, March* 1, 1803.

I Trouble you with this, in anſwer to your correſpondent Senex, whoſe letter appeared in your laſt number; and I do ſo with the more pleaſure, as it gives me another opportunity of obſerving the attention of your very numerous readers to an inſtitution of the greateſt and moſt beneficial importance to the intereſts of this kingdom, namely, *The Society for the Suppreſſion of Vice.*

Your correſpondent Senex expreſſes himſelf deſirous of knowing with what deſcription of men the ſociety has originated.

Be it known then, that this ſociety owed its earlieſt origin to men of ſound Chriſtian faith, tried loyalty, and moſt firm and ſteady friends of that true glory of Britain, the venerable and Apoſtolic Church of England; and that the members thereof are confined to thoſe of the eſtabliſhed Church.

But for further and moſt ſatisfactory information of the origin, plan, and views of this ſociety, I take leave to refer to the firſt part of their Addreſs to the Public, lately publiſhed, price 2s. and which may be had of Meſſrs. Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard; and of E. Spragg, No. 16, King-ſtreet, Covent-garden.

And, Mr. Editor, before I conclude, permit me to ſay, that all men, be their ſtation what it may, be their abilities as extenſive as poſſible, who really love their country, and would promote its beſt intereſts, are called upon to peruſe with attention, the Addreſs (to the Public) of the Society for the Suppreſſion of Vice; for its pages do contain matters that moſt imperiouſly call for ſincere and deep conſideration. Can any reaſonable man for a moment heſitate to admit, that the mere circumſtance of a ſociety, profeſſedly inſtituted for the purpoſe of ſuppreſſing ſuch a ruinous and miſerable a thing as vice, does call for attention;—calling then for attention, every wiſe and conſiderate man will enquire into their views and inform himſelf of their whole plan. If men will therefore only act thus far reaſonably, the Addreſs of this Society will be generally read; and if generally read, I am convinced it cannot fail to produce the moſt extenſive encouragement and ſupport to the inſtitution, and by that means be of moſt beneficial influence. I only wiſh the merits of ſuch an inſtitution to be fairly canvaſſed, that it ſhould have an impartial hearing, and to prevent, if poſſible, its real merits being overlooked amidſt the libellous and noiſy clamour of inconſiderate men; and I would moſt earneſtly requeſt every well-minded man to give his reaſon fair play in a diſcuſſion ſo important;

portant; for it is moſt lamentable to conſider that in an age, the pretended boaſt of which is a free and candid exerciſe of the human mind, it ſo often happens that the ſneer of the thoughtleſs, the oppoſition of the profligate, and the craftineſs of the infidel, ſtand in the place and get the better of reaſon itſelf. I call then upon men of reaſon to conſider this Addreſs, and having done ſo, I am confident the reſult will be ſuch as to give the cauſe of vice the ſevereſt blow—to ſhew it in all its horrid deformity—to prevent much of its evil, and to puniſh its obſtinate and notorious abettors.

Having the cauſe of this ſociety moſt earneſtly at heart, I could not refrain from ſaying thus much, to promote an inſtitution, which would, in his corrupt times, have met with the encouragement of that truly great ſtateſman, Lord

CLARENDON.

P. S. To convince the public that the Society for the Suppreſſion of Vice are really in earneſt, and by numbers of annual ſubſcribers are making rapid progreſs in the great work they have undertaken, their addreſs informs the world that their numbers are already above Five Hundred and Fifty:—every week adds many new names; and as the inſtitution is more known, little doubt can be entertained of complete ultimate ſucceſs; for ſucceſs cannot be better and more effectually enſured than by numbers—great numbers—of men ſteadily combining their united efforts in one common cauſe.

The ſecretary of the Society, through whoſe means any perſon may be propoſed and ballotted for becoming a member, is Mr. Pitcher, Charles-ſtreet, Covent Garden.

LEGAL PENALTIES ON ORDAINED SCHISMATICS.

TO THE EDITORS.

GENTLEMEN,

THE public are much indebted to you for expoſing the frauds and machinations daily practiſed by the Methodiſts, and for pointing out the infamy of thoſe falſe brethren who having ſubſcribed to the Articles and Doctrines of the Church, and procured poſſeſſion of benefices within her boſom, preach ſchiſm from her pulpits, and frequent conventicles founded in oppoſition to that Church. I beg leave, through the channel of your Review, to point out to the obſervation of the clergy in general, that theſe traitors to the Church are liable, under the 22d of Charles II. chap. 1. ſect. 3, to a penalty of 20*l.* for every time they preach in a conventicle; that is, out of the Eſtabliſhed Church. This act being repealed by 1 W. and M. 18. commonly called the Toleration Act, in favour of *Diſſenting Miniſters* only.—A clergyman holding a benefice cannot ſo call himſelf.

LAICUS.

April 7, 1803.

POETRY.

POETRY.

THE following Ode has been put into our hands by a friend, and, never having ſeen it in print, we cannot reſiſt the temptation of laying it before our readers, who, we think, will be as much pleaſed with the peruſal of it, as we have been ourſelves. Certainly the vice which it laſhes is as prevalent now as at any former period; and the ſatire, therefore, could never be better applied. "The little Tale of Woe" which it contains, ſays a fair critic, whoſe purity of taſte can only be exceeded by the ſoundneſs of her principles, the ſolidity of her judgment, and the correctneſs of her conduct, "ſtrikes me as being related with a ſingular degree of elegant and pathetic ſimplicity."

AN ODE TO SCANDAL. By T. TIERNEY, Eſq. M. P.

O Thou, whoſe all-conſoling power
Can ſooth our cares to reſt,
Whoſe touch in ſpleen's moſt vap'riſh hour
Can calm each female breaſt;
Thee I invoke! great genius hear!
Pity a lady's ſighs;
Without thy kind relief be near,
Poor Coquetina dies.

Haſte thee then and with thee bring
Many a little venom'd ſting;
Many a tale that no one knows,
Of ſhall-be nameleſs belles and beaux,
Juſt imported curtain lectures,
Winks and nods and ſhrewd conjectures;
Half a dozen ſtrange ſuſpicions
Built on ſtranger ſuppoſitions;
Unknown marriages ſome twenty,
Private child-bed linen—plenty;
And horns juſt fitted to ſome people's heads,
And certain powder'd coats—and certain tumbled beds.

Teach me, powerful genius, teach
Thine own myſterious art
Safe from retaliation's reach
To throw detraction's dart.
So ſhall my hand an altar raiſe,
Sacred to thy tranſcendent praiſe,
And daily with aſſiduous care
Some grateful ſacrifice prepare.

The firſt informations
Of loſt reputations
As offerings to thee I'll reſign;
And the earlieſt news
Of ſurpriz'd billet-doux
Shall conſtant be ſerv'd at thy ſhrine.

Intrigues by the ſcore
Never heard of before,
Shall the ſacrifice daily augment;
And by each Morning Poſt
Some favourite toaſt
A victim to thee ſhall be ſent.

Heav'ns! methinks I ſee thy train
Softly tripping o'er the plain.
All the alphabet I view,
Stepping forward two by two.
Huſh! for as they coupled walk,
Sure I hear the letters talk;
Though lowly—fearful—whiſp'ring—half they ſmother,
The well-concerted tales they blab of one another.

" Lord, who'd have thought our couſin D
" Could dream of marrying Mrs. E.
" True; I don't *like* ſuch things to tell,
" But faith I pity Mr. L;
" And were I he, the bride to vex,
" I wou'd intrigue with Mrs. X.
" But they *do* ſay that Charlotte U,
" With Fanny M, and you know who,
" Occaſion'd all—for you muſt know
" They ſet their caps at Mr. O;
" And as he courted Mrs. E,
" They thought if ſhe'd have couſin D,
" That things might be by Colonel A
" Juſt brought about in their own way."

O how the pleaſing ſtyle regales my ear;
But what *new* forms are thoſe which now appear?
See yonder in the thickeſt throng
Deſigning *Envy* ſkulks along,
Big with malicious laughter;
Faction and Cunning ſwell her train,
While ſtretching far behind in vain,
Poor Truth comes—panting after.

Now, now indeed I burn with ſacred fires,
'Tis Scandal' ſelf that every thought inſpires;
I feel, all-potent Genius, now I feel
Thy working magic thro' each artery ſteal.
At thy command my fancy warms,
And ſweetly paints the alter'd ſcene;
Thy touch now every grace deforms,
And blackens every mien.
Each moment to my prying eyes
Some freſh diſfigured beauties riſe;
Each minute I perceive ſome flaw,
That e'en ill-nature never ſaw.

" Huſh!" ſome airy whiſp'rer hints,
In accents wiſely faint,

" Divine

" Divine Cleora rather ſquints,
" Maria uſes paint.
" That tho' ſome fops of Celia prate,
" Yet be not her's the praiſe;
" For if ſhe *shou'd* be paſſing ſtraight,
" H—m! ſhe may thank her *stays*.
" Each fool of Delia's figure talks,
" And celebrates her fame,
" But for my part whene'er ſhe walks
" I vow I think ſhe's lame.
" And ſee Ma'am Harriet toſs her head,
" Lord, how the creature ſtares!
" Well—I thank God it can't be ſaid
" I give myſelf thoſe airs."

But, ſoftly, ſee yon form majeſtic come,
Whoſe awful frown ſtrikes even Scandal dumb;
Ah, me! the blood forſakes my trembling cheek,
While ſternly thus methinks I hear him ſpeak.
" Peace, ſnarling woman, peace;
'Tis Candour bids thee ceaſe;
Candour—at whoſe inſulted name
Even *thy* face ſhou'd burn with ſhame.
Too long I've ſilent ſeen
The venom of thy ſpleen;
Too long with ſecret pain
Obſerv'd black Scandal's reign;
But now with indignation ſtung,
Juſtice demands my tongue,
And bids me drag the lurking fiend to light,
And hold the deeds of darkne's up to ſight.
Look on this proſpect! and if e'er thy brow
Can feel compunction's ſickening bluſh—bluſh now.

Mark yonder weeping maid,
Sadly deſerted, laid
Beſide that mournful willow;
There every day in ſilent woe
She bids her tears inceſſant flow,
And every night forlornly pining,
Mute on her lily hand reclining,
Bedews her waking pillow.

Sweet girl, ſhe was once moſt enchantingly gay,
Each youth felt her charms and acknowledged her ſway;
No arts did ſhe uſe to acquire a grace,
'Twas good-humour alone that enliven'd her face.
Pure nature had leave in her actions to ſpeak;
The wildneſs of youth gave the bluſh to her cheek;
And her looks uninſtructed her thoughts wou'd impart,
Since her eyes only flaſh'd from the warmth of her heart.
Herſelf undeſigning, no ſchemes ſhe ſuſpected;
Ne'er dreaming of ambuſh, defence ſhe neglected.

With the youth that ſhe loved, at the moon's ſilver hour,
In confidence tender ſhe ſtole to the bower;
There he hoped to have all his deſires obtain'd,
But ſhe ſpurn'd at the inſult her virtue ſuſtain'd:
And *he*, in return for his baffled endeavour,
Gave a hint—'twas enough;—ſhe was ruin'd for ever,
A thouſand kind females her ſtory augmented;
Each day grinning Envy additions invented;
'Till ſatiated Malice had gain'd all her ends,
Had robb'd her of character—happineſs—friends.

And now ſad innocent, alone,
Shunn'd as a peſt, ſhe makes her moan;
And in unheard deſpair
Yields all-reſign'd to ſoul-conſuming care.
Yet many a time her wand'ring brain
Turns with its feveriſh weight of pain,
And then a thouſand childiſh things
The pretty mad one rudely ſings.

Or mute on the path-way ſhe gazes,
And weeps as ſhe ſcatters her daiſies;
And then in a ſtrain more diſtractedly loud
She chants the ſad thoughts of her fancy;
And ſhivers, and ſings of her cold ſhrowd,
Alas! poor Nancy!

Nay, weep not now—'tis now too late;
Thy friendſhip might have ſtopp'd her fate;
Rather now hide thy head in conſcious ſhame:
Thy tongue too buzz'd the lie that damn'd her fame."

Such is the triumph Scandal claims!
Triumph derived from ruin'd names!
Such as to generous minds unknown,
An honeſt ſoul would bluſh to own:
Nor think, vain woman, while you ſneer
At others' faults that you are clear.
No;—turn your back, you undergo
The ſelf-ſame malice you to others ſhow;
And ſoon by ſome malicious tale o'erthrown,
Like Nancy fall, unpitied and unknown.

Oh then, ye blooming fair, attend;
Oh take kind Candour for your friend;
Nor forfeit for a poor delight
That power o'er man that's yours by right.

To woman every charm was given,
Deſign'd by all-indulgent Heaven,
To ſoften every care:
Yes, ye were form'd to *bleſs* mankind,
To harmonize and ſoothe the mind,
Indeed—*indeed* ye were.

But when from thoſe ſweet lips we hear
Ill-nature's whiſper—Envy's ſneer,
Your power *that* moment dies;
Each coxcomb makes your name his ſport,
And fools when angry will retort
What men of ſenſe deſpiſe.

Leave then ſuch low purſuits as theſe,
And take a nobler road to pleaſe,
Let Candour guide your way;
So ſhall you daily conqueſts gain,
And captives, glorying in your chain,
Be proud to own your ſway.

THE following Poem was written and ſent to us ſome months ago, but the memorable declaration of LORD ELLENBOROUGH, (which we ſhall diſcuſs more at large, at ſome future opportunity) that "every publication which *tends* to vilify and degrade a foreign government *in amity* with this country is a libel," deterred us from publiſhing it at the time. As, however, the treaty of Amiens was conſidered by his Lordſhip as ſufficient proof that the government of the French Republic were in amity with us; the recent declaration of his Majeſty muſt of courſe be regarded by every one as ſufficient proof that ſuch amity no longer exiſts. Truth, therefore, is no longer a libel. And we may now, without the dread of proſecution, publiſh that which has a tendency to *vilify* and *degrade* a government, which *we* always knew, and we have, at length, his Majeſty's authority for aſſerting, had formed "a ſyſtem for the purpoſe of *degrading, vilifying*, and *inſulting* HIS MAJESTY, *and his Government.*"

THE TYRANT.

The time——from dawn to dawn.

"I hear the fleet Eumenides retire;
And cloſe behind them, the far-thundering doors
Of Erebus."

Forbear,—and follow me! Yon embers glow
Where, gorgeous lies your boaſt, in mental woe.
The glimmering tapers flaſh a twinkling light,
His haggard eyes confeſs a reſtleſs night.
Attend! then ſay what admiration's due,
When power exiſts with horrors ever new!
Obſerve!—from off his couch he wildly ſtarts;
He ſpeaks! Ah hear what miſeries he imparts!

"Who waits? Again enchearing day is riſen;
From thorns I riſe, to quit ambition's priſon,
Unfurl my ſtandard,—raiſe the clang of war,—
Oh from me drive dire midnight horrors far?

Ariſe!—who waits? Ye, peaceful, ſlumber all;
On me alone the cries of vengeance call.
Let me on horſe!—now tardy morn appears;
Thou, buſtling day! aſſuage my deathleſs fears!
Ariſe! ye minions of my fatal power;
Ye feel few torments in the midnight-hour.
Let me, amid the ſtorms of war, revive;
Let day's proud viſions with night-horrors ſtrive.
Ambition's mine! No ſocial ties I feel;
This heart approves whate'er this head ſhall ſeal.
Ne'er ſtorm'd by love, ne'er mov'd by friendſhip's glow,
I dauntleſs wade in blood and brave each foe.—
—Oh, that yon ſun would never ſink in gloom!
That ſleep were needleſs till we fill the tomb!
No *dread-unknown* pervades the dark profound,
To bid, for me, the awakening trumpet ſound!
Let me but ſway reluctant hoſts of men,
Till endleſs ſlumber ſinks me from their ken!
—Oh that the night were not! But 'tis decreed,
By day alone from horrors I am free'd.
Away!—yet hark!—what diſtant murmurs float!
Has tumult rais'd, at length, her dreaded note!—
—On me their vengeance!—hark!—again I live—
That march is mine!—ſtill mine what victories give!
Enkindling ſtrains!—now wonted ardours burn;
Thus felt I, on *Marengo*'s awful morn!"

Thus ſpeaking, ſtraight to martial ſcenes he fled;
To ſhun the horrors of a tyrant's bed!
On his approach, what rouzing ſounds ariſe!
From rattling arms, reflected light'ning flies!
See! baſely crouch his greater ſlaves in power;
See! baſer, ſee degenerate Britons cower!
—Ye, wealthy-vain, to Gallic regions fly,
To catch the callous tyrant's ſleepleſs eye;—
Be vain, ye hodings of the muſe,—be vain!
May Britons—ſee—return—to hate again!
His deadly rancour at your country's weal,
Yon impious tyrant hopes the Fates will ſeal:—
Return!—go rouze your countrymen to arms,
While, Britiſh boſoms, patriotiſm warms!—
—Hear, hear! what ſhouts of hollow joy they raiſe!
The wily tyrant dreads the impoiſon'd praiſe.
With clouded viſage wan, lo! how he ſmiles!
How darkly glances on his lengthen'd files!
But, ſoon ſhall eve her ſhadowy mantle ſpread;
Soon in repoſe, ſhall reſt the neighing ſteed:
Silence ſhall be, on war's parade, impos'd;
And the day's buſtle be by darkneſs clos'd:—
Save on his guards, thick ſtation'd round his dome,
Where the fell tyrant, living, fills his tomb;—

Such

Such may the dagger of the injur'd ward;
But, what from Conſcience, can their patron guard?

Now warrior-ſlaves the ſupper-board ſurround;
In crime ſcarce lighter than their leader found.
Un-notic'd they, his guarded ſtartings, mark;
While inward horrors writhe his aſpect dark.

Lo! now he riſes, from the feaſt, unfed;
To ſeek his ſafety by a change of bed!

Alas! the meed of ruthleſs deeds, is thine;
Ne'er be thy ſceptre with its horrors mine!

Now all is huſh,—bright midnight tapers burn;
He ſinks on down,—by care and ſorrow worn,—
But not to ſleep!—for, when the centry cries
The "*all-is-well*,"—his heart within him dies:
Alarm'd, he hears the voice of ſafety ſay—
Thou, from without, haſt nought to fear till day!
But, ah! within what rankling troubles live?
Dire fear,—remorſe; all matchleſs guilt can give.
—His quivering limbs relax!—an hideous calm!
Now forms aërial mock his graſping palm:—
Seen by the Muſe,—a dire aſſemblage ſtands!—
What numbers from Italia's claſſic lands!—
What numbers from Peruvia's mines of gold,
Whom, ſeiz'd in battle, the baſe warrior ſold!—
—More dreadly mov'd!—ah! mark his ſtraining eyes
Turn wildly where Egyptian horrors riſe!
Tremendous group! from Alexandria ſped;
Enclos'd, he ſhakes amid the gory dead!
He ſaid,—"ſtrike awe,"—no mercy let us bear,——
Uproſe the ſcreams of vengeance and deſpair!
Maiden and matron; babe and feeble age
Fell undiſtinguiſh'd by his mortal rage.
Remorſeleſs man! thoſe deeds now wring thy ſoul,
As round thy couch the torturing ſpirits ſcowl!

Slow paſſing, ſee the gaunt Arabians ſlain
Amid their waſtes, where heat and ſilence reign.
Though plunderers bred, a greater plunderer march'd,
To ſpoil and murder, through their deſarts parch'd:
Deſaix, at the ſtern tyrant's bidding, mov'd;
His deeds, more hideous than Arabian, prov'd.
Now, what thoſe horrors yield him in the grave,
His leader, living, ſeeks, in vain, to brave!

On Carmel's plains, by briny ſurges lav'd,
Where once the embattl'd Chriſtians' banners wav'd;
Where erſt, the mantled Seër's footſteps fell;
Where oft, were heard, prophetic numbers, ſwell:——
On thoſe lov'd plains, to taſte and virtue dear,
The dire invader's atheiſt hoſts appear;

When he had Gaza pass'd, elate in blood,
He march'd to redden Kison's murmuring flood,
Before him sweeping desolation hies;
Flames flashing shoot athwart Canaän skies.
On his approach, in thunders heard afar,
Fam'd Joppa fell in the unequall'd war.
Foul treachery stamp'd her crouch'd defenders' fate;
Their ghosts vindictive round the tyrant wait;
Each gaping wound, for lasting vengeance, calls;
Of Moslems murder'd fast by Joppa's walls!——
Thou, gentle Kleber; strov'st in vain to save;
And, from thy Chief, in Egypt, gaind'st a grave!
His treacherous eye glar'd with malignant joy,
When Bonn's, reluctant, yielded to destroy.
With horror pale, the shuddering troops obey'd;
Their eyes were sightless while their thunders play'd,
Captives on captives strew'd, unburied lay;
The winds were tainted on their viewless way.
Avenging rode cadaverous Pest elate;
And smote the monster's host for Jaffa's fate!——

——We came to mark the recompense of guilt,
Remorseless deeds, blood innocently spilt;——
Yet, let him, in contortions writhing lie;
From him the Muse averts her weary eye;
Till other bands of pallid spectres rise,
O'er whose blanch'd bones are spread *Samaria*'s skies:——
——Till they appear,——To dauntless *Acra* turn;
How glorious,—great! th' invader's dreadful bourne!
Where Smith immortal propp'd old Djezzar's sway;
His British hand to Moslems led the way:
Reviv'd his country's fame on sacred ground;——
Hear from yon heights what acclamations sound!
In sulphurous clouds the blasting light'nings glance,
From Acra's heroes and from madden'd France.
What peals on peals! The storming columns fall;
The dead and dying form a breathing wall;
Inlock'd the blood-stain'd hostile banners hang;
With rushing clash the reeking bayonets clang.
'Mid blasts volcanic toil the weary brave;
And, grumbling thunders creep on Jordan's wave;——
Ere Kleber quits the ford, toward Nazareth bound,
Mount Tabor shakes around the rumbling sound.
The baffled atheist fumes, where Richard stood;
Nor heeds the reeking pools of Gallic blood.——
——"Rush o'er the dying,—mount, by heaps of slain,
Once more—French grenadiers!"——He cries in vain.
Wide yawns the deadly breach,—the stormers gaze;
Refuse to mount and win his hollow praise.
Great Smith! who in the guilty Temple pin'd,
When Italy felt yon scourge of human kind;

Immortal

Immortal Smith! redoubling vengeance hurl'd;
And, drove yon tyrant back with banners furl'd.——
——See ye yon lambent flame? Hear ye no ſound?——
——The hour is come!—now keener tortures wound!——
——He ſhrouds his eyes!—the griſly bands advance,
Who fought, who ſuffer'd for thy tyrant, France!
At eve, his ſick and wounded mates regal'd;
Superior viands, grateful fumes, exhal'd;
But, ah! conceal'd ſomnific opium lay!
Each ſmil'd on each; and ſunk from pain and day!
Such was their mead, when he from Acra fled;
Each, by his poiſon, gain'd a ſandy bed!
——Another troop of injur'd French appears,
They pour their cauſe of vengeance in his ears;
Thy flat-roof'd piles, Roſetta! echo'd ſhrieks,
When ſtrangling tortures blacken'd ſickneſs' cheeks!
" Horrible deeds were done," fell ſcourge of man!
Thy bow-ſtring finiſh'd what the plague began!
——Yet more his frame is cramp'd!——how dire his ſtate!
The lingering Furies wait the voice of Fate!
——Theſe ſhades, alternate, chaunt the lays of hell;
Ah! dreadful! hear the infernal chorus ſwell!——

CHORUS.

Rack the ſimulating fiend;
Him, who ne'er to pity lean'd.
Give him his foretaſte of woe;
What the wicked feel below.
Haunting terrors rack his mind;
Rack the curſe of human-kind!
Rack the curſe of human-kind!

High on Demons' wings upborne;
Wrapt in gloom, he reigns forlorn.
Stranger to each gentler throe;
Ruthleſs cauſe of blood and woe.
E'er till dawn, be this our lay;
Till the avenger's dagger play.
Till this troubler of the world;
Down the yawning gulf be hurl'd!
Down the yawning gulf be hurl'd!

—Now, from his couch the chieftain ſtarts aghaſt;
Dim burn the tapers,—but, dread night is paſt!
Another dawn, the tortur'd tyrant ſpies;
And, from a tyrant's reſt, to buſtle hies!

CONCLUSION.

From dawn to eve, what crouching hoſts he ſways?
From eve to dawn, what horror on him preys?
Sullen he fears the praiſe of actions paſt;
For deep ton'd curſes load the hollow blaſt.

Apart

Apart from peace and virtue, what is fame?
Woe, while alive; at death, immortal ſhame!
On his dire path, red gleam the bickering flames;
Mid ſmoaking walls, wild ſhriek the injur'd dames.
Helvetia's wrongs, the hoary Alps reſound;
Her torch of freedom ſmoulders on the ground.
Yet Liberty ſhall come, in happier days;
And blow her twinkling torch into a blaze!
Slow-footed Retribution ſhall arrive;
And, from the earth, this bane of nature drive!

Ne'er praiſe ſucceſsful vice; praiſe worth and mind;
Talents employ'd for good to human-kind.
Prefer the peaſant's hut; his tranquil ſleep;
To domes where ſplendours and dire horrors meet.
Prefer the murmuring rill; the wild dove's note;
To guarded towers, where treacherous praiſes float.
Freedom to move,----to mark the wrenlings neſt,—
To ſee lone Robbin ſwell his ruddy breaſt,—
To hear the zephyrs ſigh,—the waving grove;—
And fearleſs, loneſy, through the woodlands rove:—
And, when the die is caſt,---when death is near,
May ſtill the *paſt*, the awful *preſent*, chear!

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

TWO months ago we declared our opinion upon the propriety and neceſſity of aſſuming a deciſive tone, and a deciſive line of conduct in our negociation with France. "When our cabinet," we obſerved,* "has once fixed its ultimatum, a given day ſhould be preſcribed for his (Buonaparté's) anſwer; and his refuſal to accede to the terms, or his neglect to anſwer them, ſhould be conſidered as a declaration of war." Such a tone, and ſuch a line of conduct have, at length, been adopted by our miniſters, and matters have been brought to that iſſue to which they might, with equal facility, as it appears to us, have been brought nearly two months ſooner. The correſpondence and communications between the two governments, which are now before the public, will, at leaſt, prove to the readers of the ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW, the juſtice of all our remarks, from October, 1801, to the preſent moment, reſpecting the views and deſigns of the Corſican Uſurper, and the remonſtrances of his Ambaſſador in this country. We firſt noticed the attempt to cajole our miniſters into an unconſtitutional effort to impoſe farther reſtrictions on the freedom of the preſs; we firſt, and *alone*, commented on the remonſtrance of ANDREOSSI reſpecting the publication of Sir ROBERT WILSON; and there is ſcarcely a ſentiment which we uttered on the ambitious projects of Buonaparté, and his inveterate hatred of Great Britain; or on the ultimate object and natural reſult of thoſe projects, and of that hatred, which are not fully and completely

* Vol. xiv. p. 334.

juſtified

juſtified by the official papers. On the anſwer which ought to be given to his complaints on the liberty of our preſs, complaints unprecedented in their nature, and unparalleled for their audacity, our miniſters, it now appears, fully concurred with us in opinion. We always maintained that the Britiſh preſs was as free to comment on the proceedings of Buonaparté, his miniſters, and government, as the French preſs was to comment on the conduct of the Britiſh government; that no application for proſecution or puniſhment ſhould be made on either ſide, but that the writers of both countries ſhould be left at liberty to contend for the juſtice of their poſitions, and the validity of their proofs, while each had the power of prohibiting the publications of the other. In this literary conteſt, indeed, or rather in this manly appeal to the judgment of Europe, we could not have failed to ſucceed, becauſe we had, invariably, truth, juſtice, the ſtrength of reaſoning, and the evidence of facts, on our ſide. And of this the Corſican Uſurper ſeems to have been aware, for, not content with prohibiting the importation of Engliſh productions, he inſiſted upon the ſame tyranny being eſtabliſhed over the Britiſh preſs, by the fiat of the Britiſh monarch, as he has, by his own mandate, eſtabliſhed over the preſs of France; and had even the impudence to aſſert, in the face of the world, that where ſuch tyranny did not prevail, there could be no ſuch thing as a *government*. Lord HAWKESBURY's anſwer to this ſingular application was perfectly congenial with the principles which we advanced on the ſubject at the time, and was, indeed, ſuch as it became a Britiſh miniſter to make. It did honour to his underſtanding, and proved the accuracy of his notions on a ſubject of primary importance. But while we render this tribute of juſtice to his Lordſhip, we cannot but repeat our ſtrong apprehenſions that the freedom of the preſs has received a fatal blow from the doctrine advanced by the Chief Juſtice of the King's Bench upon the trial of Peltier, and, ſubſequently, by the ſame perſonage, in his ſenatorial capacity, in the Houſe of Peers. We ſhall here record his Lordſhip's doctrine, and take another opportunity of diſcuſſing it at large, for it muſt be fully and deeply diſcuſſed; indeed, we incline to think, that without a *declaratory act* on the ſubject, after the promulgation of ſuch doctrine by ſuch authority, the freedom of the preſs will be utterly annihilated. The doctrine ſtated on Peltier's trial was this, that *every publication which tends to vilify and degrade a foreign government at peace with this country is a libel.* The doctrine ſtated by his Lordſhip in the debate of Monday, May 24th, was, that *any publication reflecting on a foreign government at amity with us is a libel, on the principle, that it has a tendency to promote a breach of the King's peace.* We have taken great pains to aſcertain the preciſe words uſed by his Lordſhip on both occaſions. Two friends who attended Peltier's trial agree in the accuracy of the firſt aſſertion, and reſpecting the laſt, we quote the words from memory, having heard them ourſelves; we will not therefore vouch for their *literal* accuracy, but we pledge ourſelves for the *ſubſtantial* correctneſs of the doctrine as advanced by his Lordſhip. Our readers will perceive that ſuch doctrine opens a vaſt field for reflection and inquiry; to us, we confeſs, it is perfectly *novel*, and we ſhould be infinitely obliged to any of our *legal* readers, or correſpondents, to point out any ſtatute, any precedent, or any authority of any kind, to ſanction it, either wholly or partially. It is no diſreſpect to a very young judge, or a very young politician, not implicitly, and without examination, to receive his dicta as law, particularly when he has himſelf, on more occaſions than one, overruled the dicta of his predeceſſor, who certainly

tainly had more experience, and, it is fair to presume, more knowledge, because knowledge is, in a great measure, the fruit of experience. There was a time when the bare mention of such a fact as this would have instantly provoked a discussion, that would have demonstrated either the fallacy, or the validity, of the principle advanced; and, even in this passive, torpid, temporising age, in which all the moral and patriotic feelings of our countrymen seem, unhappily, to be absorbed in selfish gratifications, one writer, at least, shall be found, to probe a question, pregnant with such serious and important consequences, to the very bottom.

We are at length at *War*. The King has exercised his lawful perogative, and the Treaty of Amiens, that fatal stake to which the Corsican Usurper wished to tie our Ministry, while he himself roamed at large, and preyed upon the world, is, happily for this country, and happily for Europe, *no more*. When we say *happily*, let it not be falsely inferred, that we prefer war to peace, or that we do not feel as deeply, as either Mr. *Wilberforce* or Mr. *Thornton*, for the horrors, the distresses, the calamities of war. We deprecate all such inference, the falshood and injustice of which we demonstrated in our Political Summary for March; and happy were we to hear the same sentiments, both on this subject and on the nature of the war in which we are embarked, advanced, in a recent debate before alluded to, by that genuine patriot and eminent statesman, Lord GRENVILLE. But we rejoice at the termination of that Treaty, because we believed it to be highly injurious to the interests of our Country, and pregnant with the seeds of war, which must, ere long, have unfolded themselves, and, possibly, at a time when we should have been less prepared for the contest. We now stand upon a new ground, with the advantage of additional experience, and with the conviction of the necessity of either reducing the strength of our enemy, or of increasing our own, until that relative proportion be duly established, without which there can be neither security for us, nor independence for Europe. It is essential, however, that the object of this war should be clearly understood and correctly defined. To call it a war for Malta, is to narrow its object so as to destroy its importance. Valuable and necessary as that fortress is to defeat the views of our enemy on Egypt, which, be it remembered, was always uniformly asserted by us to be the object of his ambition, while we declared our deliberate opinion that, in war or peace, by force or intrigue, he would, sooner or later, attain it (an opinion since verified by the Consul's own declarations), the surrender of it to us, even in perpetuity, would afford us but a slender security against the gigantic power of France; and, therefore, should not induce us to disarm. The real cause of the war is the enormous aggrandizement of our natural enemy, the direction of her power, obtained by injustice and employed for oppression, to the destruction of the independence of all other States, to the subversion of the Law of Nations, and, more especially, to the long projected ruin of Great Britain, displayed in every act of her government, relative to this country. The sword, therefore, cannot, with safety, be sheathed, until we have reduced that power within some reasonable bounds, or have acquired some more solid, substantial, and effective security against its destructive effects, than any which the Treaty of Amiens supplied, or the mere surrender of Malta would afford. That the contest will be long, arduous, and burthensome, can be doubted by none, who know the nature of revolutionary resources, or the inveterate hatred of our enemy. But, unless all patriotic feeling be utterly subdued in the minds of Britons, unless they have lost all

sense

ſenſe of honour, and all notions of dignity, they will chearfully ſubmit to the burdens which *neceſſity* impoſes. Indeed, they have only a choice of evils. To make great ſacrifices for the ſupport of their country, for the ſupport of their altars, their throne, their laws, and their liberties; or elſe to produce a ſhort and precarious reſpite from an inveterate enemy, and ſo baſely poſtpone, for a while, the hour of inevitable ruin, when the *whole* muſt go, whereas a *part* would now ſuffice to ſecure their ſafety. In ſhort, for 'twere folly of the worſt ſpecies, 'twere puſillanimity the moſt groveling, to conceal from ourſelves the danger of our ſituation, we muſt ſacrifice luxuries to enſure the continuance of comforts—we muſt ſacrifice comforts to enſure the continuance of neceſſaries;——we muſt ſacrifice a part of our neceſſaries to enſure a continuance of the reſt. We muſt do this, and do it chearfully too, that all our ſtrength and reſources may be immediately called into action, or elſe tamely bow our necks to the yoke of France, bend to her will, receive the orders of her generals and proconſuls, and ſubmit to the fate of Holland, Switzerland, and Piedmont. It is with this conception of its object, with this conviction of its nature, that the war ſhould be begun, continued, and ended. But let not Miniſters deceive themſelves with the vain expectation that ſacrifices like theſe will be chearfully borne, if the poſſeſſion of Malta alone be the avowed object of the conteſt; nor, unleſs it be diſtinctly declared, that they are reſolved, if poſſible, to reſiſt the extenſion of French power, to reſtore the independence of the neighbouring States, and to obtain for this country, in the moſt comprehenſive import of the terms, "Indemnity for the paſt, and ſecurity for the future."

It was with ſentiments of equal ſurprize and concern, that we heard a long and pathetic Eulogy pronounced on the notable project for retaining *Malta* for ten years, at which period another Iſland, in the Mediterranean, which our political geographers have recently diſcovered, and which certainly now figures for the firſt time among objects of political contention, would be fortified and prepared for the reception of our fleets and armies! In the miſerable whine of the Wilberforcean School the wonderful advantages reſulting to mankind from ten years of repoſe, (which, with an utter ignorance as it would ſeem of the nature of French ambition and of the extent of its views, though with an honeſt ſimplicity of ſoul, was, to our utter aſtoniſhment, deduced as a neceſſary conſequence of this extraordinary arrangement,) were preſſed upon the attention, with a ſtrength of voice and a vehemence of geſture, which, in any other place, would probably have produced the deſired effect. But let us ſeriouſly aſk, would any Miniſter be bold enough to adviſe his Majeſty to accept, as an "Indemnity for the paſt and a ſecurity for the future," the temporary poſſeſſion of this important fortreſs, this fragile aſſurance of a ten year's peace? We do not believe ſuch a Miniſter is to be found. 'Tis the mere puling of baby politicians, not the manly voice of experienced Stateſmen.

What an admirable contraſt to ſuch miſerable ſentiments did the manly language of our ROYAL PRINCES exhibit. Not a man who heard it, unleſs, indeed, he were callous to feeling, but felt his heart glow with enthuſiaſm, on hearing the truly Britiſh ſentiments that flowed from their lips; felt it beat reſponſive to the noble call to rally round the throne, in defence of our rights, our liberties, and laws. We truſt, too, that the energetic exhortations of LORD MOIRA, not to waſte our reſources in fruitleſs attempts to reduce the power of our enemy by colonial conqueſts, but

to ſtrike a deciſive blow in Europe, will meet with that degree of attention which its importance unqueſtionably deſerves. The war, to be ſucceſsful, muſt be an *offensive* war; a *defensive* ſyſtem of warfare might, and would, have ſucceeded in 1801, if it had been adopted in lieu of the treaty of Amiens, but the change which has ſince taken place in the relative ſituation of the two countries, renders a different ſyſtem neceſſary *now*.

On the grounds of this war, on its juſtice, on its *necessity*, we ſhould think there could not be two opinions *in* the kingdom, were Mr. Fox *out* of it. Any one of the acts of aggreſſion ſpecified in the king's declaration would have been deemed, by the wiſeſt of our ſtateſmen of former periods, an ample ground of war. On peruſing that declaration, and the documents on which it is founded, we are only aſtoniſhed at the perſevering patience, and ſyſtematic forbearance of his majeſty's miniſters—a patience and a forbearance which, we fear, have greatly lowered this country in the eſtimation of foreign powers, and to which may fairly be imputed much of the inſolent and contemptuous conduct of the Corſican Uſurper. The *experimental* politicians of the day, however, have had their wiſhes fully gratified by the experiment of a peace, which confirmed the regicide republic of France in the full poſſeſſion of all the fruits of ten years rapine and plunder. Their experiment has woefully failed, as we confidently predicted it would, but if they have derived knowledge from experience, will candidly confeſs their errors, amend their ways, profit by their diſappointment, and ſecure the nation from the irreparable miſchief and the irretrievable ruin which would infallibly accrue from the concluſion of a ſimilar peace, of a peace, we mean, founded on the ſame principles, and regulated by the ſame narrow and contracted notions, we ſhall have the conſolation, at leaſt, of knowing that ſuch experience, though dearly bought, has not been uſeleſs, and that while the experiment has been pregnant with danger, it has not been wholly unproductive of profit. In reſpect of the ſentiments of Mr. Fox, they are ſuch as we fully expected from *him*. The man who could be deemed worthy the eſteem of Buonaparté, the man who could publickly exult in a peace *because* it was glorious to the enemies of his country, is a man who can be ſwayed by any principles, who can avow any ſentiments, but ſuch as diſtinguiſh the enlightened ſtateſman, the honeſt patriot, the ſteady friend of virtue and of truth. Such a ſpeech as that which he is ſaid to have delivered in the Houſe of Commons, and which has been induſtriouſly circulated throughout England, as his, and will ſoon be tranſplanted into the papers of the Moniteur, and ſo circulated throughout Europe, would, at any other period, have excited an univerſal cry of indignation. A ſpeech ſo falſe in principle, ſo fallacious in deduction, ſo perverſive of facts, ſo ingeniouſly palliative of the moſt unprecedented injuſtice, the moſt abominable tyranny, the moſt flagrant violation of all public law, the moſt glaring outrage on all eſtabliſhed uſages, the moſt ſcandalous attacks on civil and political liberty, the moſt ſhameleſs breach of good faith, and the moſt wanton invaſions of the rights and freedom of independent ſtates, was never, thank Heaven! before delivered by an *Engliſhman*, nor indeed by any one but ſome hired advocate of a regicidal uſurper. Sunk and wallowing in the mire of faction, loſt to all ſenſe of public honour and of national feeling, proſtituting the talents which he has received from nature to the defence and ſupport of that man and of that ſyſtem, which have, for their ſyſtematic, unvaried, and *avowed* object, the deſtruction of his country's independence, the ruin of her commerce, the annihilation of

her

her monarchy, the ſubjugation of her people, and the eraſure of her name from the liſt of independent ſtates;—ſo ſunk and ſo loſt, does the *Honourable* CHARLES FOX, the early-proclaimed friend of *liberty*, and erſt the determined enemy of France, now exhibit himſelf to the eyes of his countrymen. The loathſome ſpectacle is as diſguſting to others as it is degrading to himſelf.

Yet this ſpeech, ſo full-fraught with miſchief, is detailed at length in the public prints, while the anſwers to it are all moſt baſely ſuppreſſed; and while every ſentiment and every expreſſion of one of the moſt eloquent, animated, and impreſſive harangues, ever addreſſed by an orator to a public aſſembly, in any age or country,—our readers will eaſily ſuppoſe we mean the ſpeech of Mr. PITT,—is equally loſt to the public. Thus the poiſon is gone forth without the antidote, and thus is France ſupplied, through the medium of the Britiſh preſs, with a much more able defence of her atrocious conduct, than either the art of her Conſul or the ingenuity of his miniſter, could deviſe. Such is the uſe which the conductors of ſome of our journals have made of the privilege of admiſſion into the gallery of the Houſe of Commons, a privilege which certainly ought to have been either granted or withholden, during the *whole* of that important debate. We truſt, however, that a regard for his country will induce ſome member who heard this admirable ſpeech, and who retains its leading ſentiments and its prominent features, ſtill to give it to the world. On ſuch an occaſion, and for ſuch a purpoſe, a ſingle deviation from eſtabliſhed rule would ſurely be juſtifiable.

We have read with attention the counter-declaration of the French government, given to the world by its truſty agent, Emanuel Talleyrand, whoſe political life will appear in the next number of our Review, forming the *ſecond* of our Revolutionary Portraits. The text on which this apoſtate prieſt dilates with more impudence than judgment is that with which the ſagacity of his maſter ſupplied him—the *Treaty of Amiens*, the *whole Treaty of Amiens*,—and *nothing but the Treaty of Amiens*, and in the curious exhibition of diplomatic reaſoning which follows, he has certainly parodied, with much ſucceſs, the well-known form of our oaths—*the truth, the whole truth*, and *nothing but the truth*;—for ſuch a maſs of *falſhoods* never iſſued from any cabinet but that of Republican France. We muſt not, however, deny him the meed of ingenuity, for he has certainly made the moſt of the advantage which our miniſters ſo improvidently afforded him by the Treaty of Amiens. He tells them, and with ſome ſhow of reaſon, that they have no right to complain of a ſyſtem of uſurpation which they ſanctioned and confirmed by that treaty; and that it is not for them to condemn the invaſion of the rights of independent powers, when they acknowledged the principle by accepting the *Spaniſh* ſettlement of *Trinidada*, and the *Dutch* iſland of *Ceylon*, from the hands of *France*.

Such is the ſubſtance of this paper, as far as it reſpects the defence of the Republican Cabinet. But in other reſpects, it is a maſter-piece of fraud, falſehood, and impudence; diſplaying the ſpirit of Mr. Fox without his caution, his boldneſs without his judgment. Who, for inſtance, but this hobbling ſtateſman, this apoſtate prieſt, this rebel to his Sovereign and his God, could have the ſhameleſs effrontery to proclaim to inſulted Europe, the *juſtice* and the *moderation* of a man whoſe whole reign has been a continued ſeries of acts of ſyſtematic *injuſtice*, whoſe ambition is inordinate, and whoſe luſt of power is inſatiate; and the ſtill more ſhameleſs audacity to declare,

" *that*

"*that nothing shall oblige the French Government to dispose of countries which do not belong to it,*"—that very government which robbed the Grand Duke of Tuſcany of his dominions, and gave them to a new monarch of their own creation, whoſe principal fortreſſes are, to this moment, manned by their own troops; who depoſed the King of Sardinia, in breach of a ſolemn promiſe to the Ruſſian Emperor; who have transferred the inhabitants of a whole country, like flocks of ſheep, from one proprietor to another, not only without their conſent, but in contradiction to their declared will; who have plundered half the Princes of Germany of their lawful poſſeſſions, and exerciſed, in ſpite of remonſtrance, and in ſpite of every reſiſtance ſhort of *arms*, acts of ſovereignty the moſt complete and the moſt oppreſſive over the ſtates of Switzerland and Holland, whoſe freedom and independence they had publicly recognized, and ſolemnly guaranteed;—whoſe whole conduct, in ſhort, has been in ſuch direct oppoſition to this declaration, that it is ſcarcely conceivable that any rational being ſhould have dared to publiſh it to the world. But ſo long have Buonaparte and his hirelings been accuſtomed to impoſe on the ſubjugated people of France, that they doubtleſs think the ſame impoſitions, however groſs, however at variance with truth, and however repugnant to common ſenſe, will paſs current with the reſt of Europe. On one only point has *Citizen* Talleyrand, incautiouſly, ſuffered the truth to eſcape him, in the declaration, *that France will consent to nothing that compromises its* POWER. It is hence perfectly evident, that all the objections of the Conſul to our retention of Malta, had reference to ſchemes for the extenſion of his *power* with which our occupation of that fortreſs would interfere. It is then, on the part of France, a *war of power*; and, on our part, a war of ſelf-preſervation, rendered neceſſary by the increaſed and perpetually increaſing power of France, which has an inevitable tendency, and will be invariably directed, to promote our ruin.

It would be a libel on our countrymen to ſuppoſe that, in ſuch a conteſt, begun on OLD ENGLISH PRINCIPLES, and conducted, we hope, with OLD ENGLISH VIGOUR; there can exiſt any difference of opinion, any relaxation of effort, any reluctance to ſubmit to privations and ſacrifices for its ſupport. But, we repeat, to ſecure this unanimity, it will be indiſpenſibly requiſite to explain the true nature and object of the war, and to look our ſituation fairly and fully in the face. It will be alſo as neceſſary to form an union of all the talents and knowledge of the kingdom; and, after a ſolemn and candid enquiry into the paſt conduct of his Majeſty's miniſters, which ſome eminent ſtateſmen have promiſed to inſtitute, and which the miniſters themſelves are willing to meet, to ſuſpend all party differences, and to forego all party diſputes, in order more effectually to promote the attainment of that object, which every loyal ſubject and every true Briton muſt have neareſt to his heart.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Dr. HAWEIS's Vindication of his Church Hiſtory,—the Political Life of TALLEYRAND,—and P. R.'s Conjectures on the Completion of a Prophecy, ſhall appear in our next number.